

A
D E F E N C E
O F
The Vindication
O F
K. Charles the Martyr;
JUSTIFYING
HIS MAJESTY'S TITLE
T O
'ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ'.
In ANSWER to
A Late Pamphlet intituled *Amyntor*.

By the Author of the *Vindication*.

L O N D O N,
Printed by W. Bowyer, at the White Horse in Little Bri-
tain: And Sold by most Booksellers in London
and Westminster. MDCXCIX.

A
D E F E N C E

OF

The Glorification

OF

K. Charles the Martyr

JUSTIFYING

HIS MAJESTY'S TITLE

EIKON BAZILIKH.

IN ANSWER TO

A Late Pamphlet intitled Answer

By the Author of the Vindication.

Printed by W. Basset, at the Horse Shoe in Little Britain: And Sold by most Bookellers in London and W. Gough, in WINDSOR.

A

D E F E N C E

Of the

VINDICATION

O F

K. CHARLES the Martyr, &c.

NEXT to no Adversary, a fair one is the best; and by a fair Adversary I mean, not such a one who will spare his Adversary's Arguments, but who will not conceal them; who will represent the Cause plainly, and examine it thoroughly; and though he inclines to one, is equally just to both sides of the Question, and will give his Readers the strength of his Adversary's Cause as well as his own. This method, if it does not carry the Cause, deserves commendation; if the Adversary is not convinc'd, he cannot complain. But the Author I have now to deal with is of a clean contrary temper, he likes it much better to suppress severall Arguments, and some the most material, than either to represent, or answer them; and even of those he does vouchsafe to mention, he takes especial care to leave out all their strength, and gives his Reader only the Bones and Skeleton, without the Sinews, and there is not one Argument that he hath placed in its due light, or answer'd in its due force; so

that instead of fairly debating, he hath only disguised the Controversie, and muffled it up that no body may perceive it; by which means he abuses his Reader, himself, and his Cause too, as well as me; when instead of disabling the force of my Reasons, he very forrily evades them, and frames a company of trifling Exceptions, some out of my words, and some out of his own; but allways below, sometimes contrary to my sense; and then gives us trifling Answers to them.

This all understanding men will take to be a very severe accusation, and I confess it is so; but as severe as it is, it is withall most true, and I do directly and in plain terms charge it upon this Author, and beg no mans candor, but only the Reader's patience to make it good in every particular.

The first thing that occurs, is the Memorandum said to be written by the Lord Anglesey.

Memorandum.

King Charles the Second, and the Duke of York, did both (in the last Session of Parliament, 1675. when I shewed them; in the Lords House, the written Copy of this Book, wherein are some corrections and alterations written with the late King Charles the First's own hand) assure me, that this was none of the said King's compiling, but made by Doctor Gauden, Bishop of Exeter; which I here insert for the undeceiving others in this point, by attesting so much under my hand.

ANGLESEY.

Vindic. p. 4.

To this my first Answer was, "That Both the said Kings
 " have attested the contrary by their Letters Patents; those
 " of King Charles bear date Nov. 29. 1660. and expressly
 " and particularly take notice of this Book, as his Father's,
 " in these remarkable expressions, *especially those most excellent Discourses and Soliloquies by the name of* *divine banishment*.
 " Those of King James bear date Feb. 22. 1685. and expressly

“ presly refer to the first Edition of the King’s Works 1662.
 “ in which his Majesty declares *the Works of his Royal Fa-*
ther were printed. These are publick and authentick
 instruments, the highest and most uncontestable Evidence
 that a King of *England* can give to any matter; and cer-
 tainly something very considerable ought to be offer’d be-
 fore they are laid aside, and especially before the authori-
 ty of the King’s Evidence be translated from the Broad
 Seals to a blind Paper. But our Author treats the Broad
 Seals with the same ceremony as the Kings themselves,
 nothing so mean and contemptible but is sufficient to over-
 throw the honour of the one, and credit of the other. But
 let us take his Answer in order.

And here he begins fairly, as in the first place, to mistake
 my meaning, contrary to as plain Words as a Man could
 speak: The Reader need not be reminded, that this is
 an Answer to the *Memorandum*, and design’d to shew, that
 the Two Kings had a direct contrary opinion of the Au-
 thor of the Book, to what is assign’d by the *Memorandum*.
 Now though our Author says, that he would begin with
 the Exceptions to that, yet for some good reason or other,
 he hath transplanted this Answer, and ranged it under ano-
 ther head; and according to him, it is one of the *Facts* P. 130.
which are alledged to prove Charles the First was the true
Author of Icon Basilike. But if they were ever alledged
 for that purpose, it is by himself, and not by me: For I
 never alledged the Letters Patents to prove that King the
 true Author, and I had declar’d so as plain as I could
 speak: my words are, “ The immediate Question here is
 “ not Who was the Author of this Book? but Who was Vindic. p. 4.
 “ so in the opinion and judgment of those two Kings?
 So that by his favour, I alledged them not to prove who
 was the true Author, but what was the true sense and
 judgment of those Kings: And if our Author can mistake
 such plain expressions, and those negative too, the Reader
 may be the less surpris’d if he meets with the same practice
 so often hereafter. Well, though our Author mistakes it,
 it may be he may answer it, and that is enough at one
 time,

time, and a little too much, I find, for some Authors. And thus we have it:

Which (the Letters Patents) says Mr. W. contradict what he's believ'd to say to my Lord Anglesey, that is, the Memorandum; for I know of no authority he hath to put his own belief into my answer, and not content with that, to tell his Readers I say it too; whereas I neither said it, nor believe it: I say indeed that the Letters Patents contradict the Memorandum, but what he or any other man believes concerning the Kings speech to my Lord Anglesey, I neither say nor know, whatever some may pretend. But changing the terms is but a small fault, when there are so many greater; and therefore let us pass to his Reply, and thus it follows, But with his good leave the Conclusion does not follow. What Conclusion is that? why, That the Letters Patents contradict the Memorandum. This it seems is that which in our Author's extraordinary judgment does not follow, which is one of the strangest things in the world: The Letters Patents expressly and in terms own King Charles the First to be the Author, the Memorandum as expressly denies it, and asserts, that not He, but Bishop Gauden was the Author: Now these are his Premises as well as mine, and let him try his skill, if it be possible for him, or any man else, to make any thing else follow, than that the Letters Patents and the Memorandum contradict each other; which is the very Conclusion he asserts does not follow, and asserts it with triumph too, with his good leave the Conclusion does not follow. And his reason for this is to as much purpose as the Answer: For (saith he) those Letters were issued out in the year 1660, before Dr. Gauden gave the King true information, and it was 1675, that he told his opinion to my Lord Anglesey, long after he was convinced that his Father had not written the Book. Now if I should grant him all this, it might doe his Cause some service, but his Argument would be never the better: and suppose for once, that King Charles upon Dr Gauden's information did say this so long after, is it not a contradiction, as well if King Charles said it, and said

said it so long after, as if any body else said it? Let who will say it, and let it be before or after, the contradiction is the same; but by our Author's way of arguing, though another may, a man cannot contradict himself, except he hath the ill fortune to doe it in the same breath; but if it be some time after, 'tis no such matter, and very consistent. I perceive this same *Time*, which hath a sovereign virtue to make up breaches and differences, hath one healing property more, even to reconcile Contradictions, and make them none at all: For although the Letters Patents do directly and in express terms contradict the *Memorandum*, yet the Conclusion does not follow, that is, they do not contradict it; and for this reason, because it was said fifteen years after. I ly at his mercy if I have mispercepted him, and desire the Reader to consult the place; for perhaps it will not be thought that a man, who pretends to write upon the *Canon*, and to correct the mistakes of the world for many ages, should himself in so few Lines be guilty of two such gross Blunders, as first to mistake my meaning, and then to mistake his own Answer.

For his Answer ought to be thus, according to his own Principles, "That granting the Contradiction between the two Assertions, yet it does not follow but King *Charles* might assert both; for that since the issuing out of the Letters Patents in 60, he had received true information from Dr. *Gauden*, and it was long after that information in 75. that he told his opinion to my Lord *Anglesey*. Now if the Reader hath so much charity as to admit this for his Answer, with all my heart: for though I do not think my self obliged either to make or mend his Answers for him, considering how unfairly he hath dealt with my Arguments and Exceptions, yet being more concerned for Truth, than any other advantage of the Dispute, I am contented his Answers should have the utmost strength they are capable of; and if he thinks I have not propos'd this to the best advantage, let him mend it himself, and then I will consider it; in the mean time this I have to say to it, as it stands clear'd of the former Blunders.

1. 'Tis

1. 'Tis sophistical, and apparently begs the Question in Controversie. Here are two suppositions that are the foundation of this Answer, *That Dr. Gauden inform'd the King, and that the King inform'd the Lord Anglesey*, and both these are Questions between us; and this is pure disputing, to answer by the Question: I produce the Letters Patents in Answer to the *Memorandum*, and he replies to them by the *Memorandum* it self: This is fine Logick, and likely to forward the Controversie, and at this rate we shall never have done.

2. The distances of Time between 1660 and 1675 is just such another; for what signifies the distance between those two assertions, except it be first suppos'd that he did assert it at that distance? which is the thing in Controversie, and *Petitio Principii* again. He tells us King Charles issued out his Letters Patents in 60, and then asserted his Father was the Author; but it was afterwards in 75 that upon better information he asserted the contrary. And what now is the force of this Answer? why if the thing in controversie be admitted, if it be granted him that King Charles said so in 75, then this is an Answer, but till then 'tis most ridiculous: and that is a pure Answer indeed, which to make it signifie any thing, the whole Cause must first be given up, and then 'tis perfectly needless.

And therefore there was something else he ought to have first answer'd, and which I had urged upon this head, which concerns the *validity of the respective Testimonies* for these two assertions; and if he could have gain'd his point there, he might have drawn this by way of Conclusion; but 'tis an Answer to nothing. But that is an Argument which affects the merits of the Cause, and he is always very civil to such things, and cannot prevail with himself to offend them; and I find with some Authors 'tis far easier to beg the Question than to answer Arguments: though with his favour, I crave leave to tell him, that unless he take a little care to speak to what follows, all he hath said hitherto is perfectly lost: and therefore,

3. He

3. He is so far from answering, that he totally suppresses that upon which the Controversie turns; and that is, the Comparison between the respective Evidence in point of validity. I must here crave leave to doe our Author's business, and to repeat that which he ought both to have repeated and answer'd; but since he will not doe it, I must doe it my self: accordingly I had said, " A man would *Vindic. p.4.*
 " imagine there could not be any possible dispute which
 " was to be prefer'd, a publick and authoritative Attestation of the Kings themselves, or a private *Memorandum*
 " by a third person.----- Whether the Testimony of my
 " Lord *Anglesey* be a better proof of their sense and judgment, than their own Testimony; or a private, obscure,
 " unattested, posthumous Hand Writing, a more valid Evidence than the Broad Seals.----- That high and authoritative Evidence is allways to carry the Cause, in opposition to that which is no Evidence at all. And what does our Author say to this? Why truly not one single word; nor take the least notice of it, as if it did not concern the Question. Perhaps a reason may be given why he shifted this Answer to another head; for had he spoke to it in its proper place, some of his Readers might have been so curious as to have consider'd and compar'd the places, and then they would have easily discover'd, both his dissingenuity in dropping the main Argument, and his trifling Answer to what he does mention. For what, I wonder, does his distance between 60 and 75 signifie? when there is the best Evidence for the one instance, and none at all, or as good as none, for the other; and let the pretended time be when it will, nearer or farther off, ever or never, it signifies nothing, till the validity of the Evidence for it be first clear'd: This therefore is the only point to be debated in this case; and there neither is, nor can be any other, and upon which all the rest depend, which yet our Author will not endure to come near. This is the last resort of this Controversie, and into which it is finally resolv'd: They on that side of the Question insist on the *Memorandum*, and we on the *Letters Patents*; and which way in the world is there to
 B bring

bring this to an issue, but by considering and comparing the value and authority of the respective Testimonies, and from thence shewing which preponderates, and ought to determine the belief of an impartial man in a point of this nature? And I think I need ask no man's courtesie to answer these Questions in favour of the Cause I defend: Whether the sense and judgment of the two Kings be better collected from their own publick and authentick Declarations, or from a private and suspicious *Memorandum* of another person? And whether a blind Paper in point of Evidence, is to be prefer'd to the Broad Seals? This is the only point necessary to be spoke to, which it seems was too hot for our Author's fingers, and he let it alone: and here this branch of the Controversie rests, and here it must rest till our Author clear his hands of it.

I now come to examine his Answers to the other Exceptions I had made to the *Memorandum*; and here he is at the same trade again, concealing all that is material, intirely suppressing one whole Exception, and that the most considerable; and so mangling the rest, that he hath stripp'd them of all that is argumentative, and hath any strength in it: He is so faithfull to his Cause, as to suffer every thing to stand in full force against it; and this, if he please, he may stile defending a Cause, but his Party must be very kind, if they do not call it a betraying it.

Thus in the first place, he hath taken especial care that his Reader shall not see the *foundation* of my Exceptions, upon which, and upon which only, their whole force depends, and without which they would be no Exceptions at all, or only such silly ones as our Author makes them. And accordingly in order to make it appear that the *Memorandum* was highly lyable to the suspicion of forgery, I had said, "For the proof of this I shall take my measures from the last words of the *Memorandum*, which plainly declare the End for which it was made, and for that reason declare that it was not made nor sign'd by the said Lord: the words are these, Which I here assert for the undecerving others in this point, by attesting so much under
" my

" *my hand*: Now here are these things observable, and
 " which in every respect make this *Memorandum* defective,
 " and insufficient for the attaining this End: and then I
 immediately subjoin, *It bears no date, 'tis unattested, &c.*
 So that the plain reason why I ascribe deficiency to the
Memorandum in these respects, is because upon these ac-
 counts it is insufficient for the attaining the End proposed
 by it. This therefore is the apparent groundwork of my
 Exceptions, upon this they are supported, to this they
 have a direct and immediate reference, and this is either ex-
 press'd or implied in the Exceptions themselves; and one
 would imagine that 'twas not possible that this should be
 pretermitted, and no manner of regard had to it, by a man
 who had a mind to answer them: But, whatever he pre-
 tends, our Author is obstinately bent against answering me;
 he hath some Chimeras of his own, and builds Castles in
 the air, and then attacks them; but for my Exceptions,
 he leaves them just as he found them, and if they will be
 answer'd, as far as I can perceive, they must answer them-
 selves, our Author is not at leisure to take any notice of
 them, except it be in the Title Page.

Thus (for instance) he tells us, *'Tis urg'd that it* (the P. 97.
Memorandum) *does not particularly express by the date,*
whether it meant the last Session of Parliament before the
writing of it, or the last of the year 75. This is a wise Ex-
 ception indeed, and I desire to know who made it, for I
 am sure I never did: For, *By what date* does he mean? if
 the date of the *Memorandum*, it has none; if the date
 when these words are said to be spoken, I said *it bears*
no date with respect to the exact time of that; and what-
 ever it may be for our Author, it would be ridiculous for
 me to say it does not particularly express by that which I
 had said it does not express; and the affirming it did not
 so, is my Exception to it: but he seems as if he was will-
 fully set not to understand me. And this will appear far-
 ther when we see his Answer, which is, *when it is plain,*
that he meant the last or Winter Session, and that it was
therefore the immediate Session preceding the writing this

Memorandum. Very good, and what then? why then the Reader, if he be very easie, is to believe, that my Exception to the *Memorandum* was, that it did not particularly expresse what that last Session was; and all I had to say against it was, the doubtfulness of those expressions, whereas it is the direct contrary. I said indeed *that was express'd ambiguously*, (and I say so still, notwithstanding our Author's asserting the contrary:) but that is none of my Exception, nor did I ever urge the ambiguity as an Exception to the *Memorandum*, nor did I think it reasonable so to doe, (whatever our Author doth,) but only to shew that it was capable of two senses; which our Author very discreetly takes for the Exception it self, and formally answers it, as if I had laid great weight upon it; whereas 'tis all one to me, and to my Exception, let him interpret them which way he will, the Exception is directed against both, as any man but our Author must needs perceive: "That the *Memorandum* bears no date with respect to the "exact time when the King and the Duke are said to "have assur'd the Lord *Anglesey*: Let the ambiguity of those expressions (*the last Session*) be determin'd to what sense you will; if to the last before the writing of it, then the *Memorandum* having no date, there can be no certain time fix'd when that Session was, and consequently no determinate time when these words were spoken; and therefore a suspicious Evidence, as giving testimony to a matter of fact, and at the same time leaving the world in the dark when that fact was: But if to the last Session of that year, then also it bears no date with respect to the exact time of speaking these words, because the space of time is too large and loose to found a competent Evidence upon. A Session of Parliament may continue five, six, or seven Months, and so we have a matter of fact fastned to the compass of a hundred, two hundred or more days: so that take the sense of those expressions which way you please, the Exception affects them both, and we are still in the dark, as to the exact time when that assurance was made; that therefore the *Memorandum* is a wild and wandering Evidence,

Evidence, and extraordinary fit indeed to *undeceive others*, which for the matter it asserts hath a very loose date, and for it self hath no date at all. This and somewhat more for confirmation and illustration of it, I had said before; and does not any man see what fine work our Author has made with it? He makes a ridiculous Exception, and then answers it as ridiculously; and the Answer (such as it is) was answer'd long before he made it, and even by the Exception he pretends to answer: For let the sense he contends for be never so plain, my Exception lies against that sense equally with the other: And what can be said to such an Answerer, who will not be brought to speak to the true point, but spends his time in talking to his own shadow? I desire hereafter that he will answer my Exceptions; and for his own, he may let them alone, or dispose of them as he pleases.

Next he tells us, *To say that there is no Witness to it, is P. 98. a singular sort of objection*: I suppose, because it is so very unusual and extraordinary for men to require good proof: if our Author could persuade the world to that, it might doe his Cause some service; but when the belief of a matter of fact depends upon the credibility of the Witness, it is very strange with our Author that men should demand that: but he hath a reason, *when his Lordship's Relations, and all that have seen this, and his other Writings, own it to be his hand*. Alas, that men should be so nice and scrupulous to trouble themselves about Witnesses, when there are people enough in the world who know their hands, and there is no such thing as forgery and counterfeit to be found. This would be a wise reason in all other matters, where a man's hand is called in question, or produc'd to determine a matter in controversy. But suppose it, and let this go as far as it can, (which is more than I need to doe, till he gives better proofs than his own affirmations.) this I have to say to it, that as to his *owning it*, I doubt that expression is a little of the largest; for to own it, is in downright terms to affirm it; and I believe none of his Lordship's Relations will doe that, or hath already done it,

it, and it would be too rash and unadvised for any man to undertake it; and the utmost that can be said, is that it may be collected or guess'd at from the resemblance it bears to his Lordship's other Writings, (if indeed it does bear such resemblance;) but if our Author does not, every body else knows, that the similitude of hands is utterly insufficient to determine the least matter in the world, in opposition to a direct, evident and undeniable Testimony: for 'tis at best but a conjectural Evidence, and a conjectural Evidence against a real one is none at all; it hath of it self but very little force in point of proof, but that sinks to just nothing when the contrary is prov'd by direct Evidence; and to urge this in any other matter, would be the most ridiculous thing in the world. Suppose, for instance, a man should have his Testimony upon Record, and another produce a *Memorandum* writ by a third person, asserting he said the contrary some years after the said Record was taken, and that he conjectures it to be that person's hand, or however it is like it: Can any man in his wits think that this will baffle the Record, and a blind Paper with his conjectures upon it, be sufficient to set aside the best Evidence in the Kingdom? This sort of proceeding would be thought more fit to be laugh't at, than seriously dealt with; and this is the very case here: On the one side there are the Letters Patents directly and plainly asserting, that the King was the Author; on the other side, and for the contrary assertion, there is a blind *Memorandum*, without any Witness, and supported only by conjectures and likeness of hands, if there be that: Now at our Author's rate of arguing, this last carries the Cause invincibly, triumphs over the Broad Seals, and is more to be relied on than the best Evidence in the world. And if any man can seriously believe this, and determine his judgment by conjectures, against the most plain and evident proofs, that man may believe any thing, and all reasons and proofs are perfectly lost upon him; he is sway'd by fancy or partiality, and stands fortified by such precarious and arbitrary principles against all the convictions in the world.

w
th
Ca
'ri
bu
an
gl
S

m
th
m

J

t

c

o

world. For if the conjectural proof of a proof (which is the utmost that can be said on that side,) must carry the Cause against the most direct and unexceptionable proof, 'tis in vain to debate the matter by Reason and Evidence, but the decision of the Controversie must be left to noise and clamour, to freaks and whimsies, to humour and imagination, the wildest and most capricious things under the Sun.

Well, however that be, our Author hath yet something more to say to this point; and thus it follows, *Not is there any thing more common, than for learned or great men to leave such Memorandums in a Book concerning the Author of it, when it was a Question, or about any other secret relating to it, which they thought they had discover'd; and yet 'tis a thing unheard till now, that they were deny'd to be theirs whose Names they bear, because the day of the Month was not mention'd, nor the Names of any Witnesses added, when the hand was confessed to be the same with their other Writings.* And our Author hath a Book of Mr. Hamden's, intituled *Apollonii Galatæ*, in which he writes that *Lansbergius* was the Author of it, of whom he there gives a charaller. Now as to confession of hands, I have spoke to just before; and as to the rest, our Author hath forgot the point in controversie (as he always does;) he ought to have consider'd the End of the Memorandum, and the foundation of my Exceptions, and then it would have appear'd what an excellent parallel he makes. For is there no difference between writing Criticisms and conjectures upon Authors, and leaving the world to believe or refuse them as they see occasion, and a Memorandum pretended for Posterity, to undeceive the world, to correct popular mistakes and prejudices, and all this upon the single credit of the Memorandum it self? Men may write their Criticisms how, where, and when they please, and leave them as they please, because they signifie nothing unless supported by other and more substantial reasons; but if a man will be imposing his Testimony on the world, and expect that they should lay aside their prejudices upon the credit

credit of that Testimony, in all reason he ought to take care that it be so convey'd and corroborated, that the world may be assur'd that it, is his own Testimony, and not farther'd upon him to shew tricks with, and serve other mens turns. This my Lord *Anglesey* knew well enough, (and no man better,) and if he had wrote the Paper, he knew at the same time he was not writing Criticisms, but making an Evidence; and to fit it for that purpose, it ought to have been attested; for his Lordship knew that an unattested Paper is no Evidence in the world: and a Gentleman of his Lordship's prudence, and foresight, and great knowledge in the Laws, would never leave behind him a *Memorandum* to convince others, and at the same time leave them destitute of all fit and proper means of being convinc'd that he wrote it himself; and it was by no means suitable to his Lordship's character, to pretend to *undecieve others*, by such a deceitfull and suspicious *medium* as may create some Controversies, but can end none. Our Author pretends great skill and niceness in distinguishing between spurious and genuine Writings, and I desire to know whether these be two of his marks of spurious Writings, that they are inconsistent with the character of the Author, and that the subject matter contradicts an undeniable Testimony of the same Age.

But there was one Exception more which our Author would not meddle with, and perhaps because he could not tell how to disguise or misrepresent it; and that is, that the *Memorandum* is inconsistent with it self. The End is alladg'd to be *to undecieve others*, the Means to answer that End, the most improbable and unlikely that could be taken, and in a manner contradictory to it, "as lodging it in a vacant
Vind. p. 11. "Page of a Book, never to be seen till after his death,
 "and then liable to a thousand contingencies; to be torn,
 "to fall into private hands, to ly neglected, and never
P. 95. "see the light: And this our Author confirms, *I doubt* (saith he) *if any other than one of Mr. Millington's great curiosity, and no bigotry, had the disposal of my Lord Anglesey's Books, we should never have heard of the Memorandum.*

So

So that in our Author's own opinion this was a very un-hopefull way to secure the Ends of it, and the *Memorandum* was in the utmost hazard, when nothing could save it, and make it serviceable to these great Ends, but a conjunction of two such accidents, as that the Books should be sold by Auction, and that Mr. *Millington* should make the sale. Now the End of every thing deserves chiefly to be consider'd, as being the first and principal thing in every action, and for the attaining which, the whole is directed, and subservient: and here we have a *Memorandum* pretending a mighty zeal for Truth, and formally drawn up to *undecieve others*; and at the same time thrust up in a corner, and the persons for whose use it was design'd, must come at it as well as they can; and they must be beholden to nice and unforeseen accidents, (as our Author observes,) if ever they shall be the better for it. Suppose one man should tell another, *Sir, you are under a very great mistake*, and I have taken especial care to undeceive you, by writing down the Truth, and setting my hand to it; but I have lock'd it up in my Study, and will keep it safe enough as long as I live, but it may be you may see it after my death, though 'tis a *thousand to one you never see it at all*; and (to carry it on with our Author's observation,) there is but one way in the world for it, that *you persuade Mr. Millington to live so long, and to make the sale*. Now (setting aside our Author's jest, and which perhaps may be a true one,) what contemptible notions have men of humane nature, who can without any manifest and direct proof fasten such things on a sober and serious man, and much more on a person of his Lordship's great wisdom and caution? But this is a point our Author very quietly passes over, and leaves it to take its chance, although it is more material than any of the rest: for hereby the *Memorandum* betrays it self, discovers the forgery, and apparently shews that the Contriver forgot himself; he hath gone and assign'd an End for the writing it inconsistent with it; he hath made the Writer appear very warm and zealous to *undecieve others*, but at the

C

same

same time forgot, that the only thing whereby they should be undeceiv'd, was to be all the while conceal'd, and never to be seen, or however never that the pretended Writer either did, or could know. By this time, I suppose, the Reader may perceive, that when our Author pretermitted the foundation of my Exceptions, (and which is also the foundation of the *Memorandum* it self,) it was not out of mistake or negligence, but industriously; for here he hath done the same with this Exception, which is expressly and in terms drawn from the End of the *Memorandum*; and had he mention'd either the one or the other, he must have spoke to this point, which it seems he could not tell how to doe, and therefore thought it better to lay them wholly aside, than to be at the trouble to raise Exceptions, and when he had done, not be able to lay them again.

In farther prosecution of this Exception, and for the illustration and confirmation of it, I had added, "Had there been no other way, such a one as this must have shifted as well as it could; but when men may clear up Mistakes by living and undoubted Testimony, to commit it to a bit of Paper, and that also laid up in darkness and obscurity, seems far from that zeal to Truth that this *Memorandum* pretends to; and for which End it pretends to have been written. Had my Lord *Anglesey* no Friends, Relations, Acquaintance? &c. Which our Author thus represents, *It is no just Exception to this Memorandum, that my Lord Anglesey did not communicate the contents of it to any of his Friends or Relations.* And here in the first place, his Reader (if he will take his word) is to suppose that this was my Exception; whereas that is what is just before mention'd, and this only added to illustrate and strengthen it; and it seems, with him there is no difference between an Exception, and what is brought to clear and confirm it: But I believe he could distinguish this well enough, but he could not answer the Exception; and thought he could say something to this, and therefore by a dexterous flight of hand, hath slippt this into the place of it. And secondly, even in the manner he hath mention'd it, he hath taken
care

care to hide the reason and ground of my adding it, which is apparently, and in terms, drawn from the End of the *Memorandum*, which intimates a keen desire to *undeceive others in this point*, and consequently the same desire to propagate and spread it; and there being two such ways, as one (at the best) very uncertain and hazardous, the other plain, open, and in all points sufficient to answer that End, 'tis unaccountable his Lordship should neglect the best, and betake himself to the worst in the world; which our Author represents lamely and imperfectly, as if there was no more in it, than merely the not communicating it to his Relations; whereas had he thought it not worth his notice, or had he purpos'd not to communicate it, he might have done as he pleas'd, and neither wrote it nor told it: but when the *Memorandum* supposes such a strong impulse upon him to *undeceive others*, as to commit it to writing, 'tis unreasonable to think that the same impulse should not operate the right way, and direct his Lordship to the most proper and suitable courses to answer his End, which are obvious to the meanest understanding, and which he had every moment opportunity to doe. This is the force of my reasoning here, which our Author expresses thus loosely and generally, and without any manner of reference to it; but this concern'd *the End of the Memorandum*, and our Author is resolv'd upon no manner of account to meddle with, or mention that, least he should force himself, against his inclination, to speak to it, and therefore hath allways very cautiously slipt it out of the Question; although all men (but our Author) will think, that as it is the principal thing in the intention of the Actor, so it ought chiefly to be regarded in considering the nature of the Action. However, to let that pass, although our Author takes the liberty to make me say what he please, and represents the Exceptions as it best liketh him, and according as he thinks he can best deal with them, I hope it may not be unreasonable to expect, even from such an Answerer, that he will at least answer satisfactorily what he represents himself. And thus it follows, *For though the*

Two Royal Brothers imparted the Secret to him, it does by no means follow that they intended he should publish it to the World. No by no means, I must needs grant him that Consequence; and then in pursuance of that, and because his Lordship would not betray the King's Secrets, he did not tell this to his Friends or Relations: But then, I pray, how came he to write it, and to write it for this End too, *to undeceive others?* I suppose those *others* could not be undeceiv'd without *publishing* of it, and I suppose also, that writing is *publishing*, as well as speaking; but our Author did not think of that: and therefore this was communicated to him as *a Secret*, or as *no Secret*; if as *a Secret*, then he ought neither to tell it nor write it, except he wrote it on purpose that no body should see it, and then it was admirably contriv'd to *undeceive others*; if as *no Secret*, then that zeal for Truth (suppos'd in the *Memorandum*) would have oblig'd him to declare it, as being a thousand times more fit to answer his Ends; and the Conclusion is, let our Author's be an Answer or no Answer, let it be true or false, 'tis equally and in both respects against the *Memorandum*.

But if this will not doe, our Author hath another Answer in reserve; and that is, *Supposing they did not oblige him to silence, yet 'tis probable that his Lordship was not very fond of being disturb'd by the clamours of some Church-men who carried things so high at that time.* This is a terrible Reason: I perceive my Lord *Anglesey* was most cruelly Priest-ridden, when for fear of them, he durst not so much as whisper such a thing in the ears of his Friends, or Relations. Now if the Reader is so soft and easie, as to admit this for a Reason, let him take his liberty; but withall, let him take this along with him, that 'tis a Reason against the *Memorandum* too: For a man must stretch his faculties hard before he can believe that his Lordship would convey an ungratefull and controverted Truth in such a blind manner, and by such a defective and suspicious Paper, when at the same time, he knew for certain there would be so great and violent opposition made against

gainst it. Had his Lordship stood in such awe of the Churchmen, and expected before hand a fierce opposition, he would have made his Testimony sure enough, and transmitted it in such an unexceptionable manner, as they should not have been able to gainsay, or contradict it; whereas as it now lies, 'tis impotent and useles, lyable to all the Exceptions in the world; and the most violent opposers of the Church, how much soever they like it, have not yet been able to make the least proof of it, or to say one wise word in defence of it.

Next he tells us, *I affirm that there is no presumption* P. 100. *that the Royal Brothers communicated this to any other.* And so far he is right, I did indeed affirm it; but that he may keep his hand in, and represent nothing fairly, he adds to it of his own, *besides the Lord Anglesey*: which expression contains an implication, as if they had communicated it to my Lord *Anglesey*, though to no other; and as he hath worded it, 'tis only a small concession that gives up the whole Question: But he cannot be trusted with any thing, and allways spoils it in the handling; and I have ten times more trouble to rescue my sense out of his hands, and to set it streight, than to answer any thing he hath objected against it. And now let us proceed to his Answer, *Which* (saith he) *is a negative Argument, and proves nothing.* Very right, and I had told him so before, in so many words, [" This I confess is a negative;] and it is somewhat extraordinary to give that very thing in answer which I had before admitted and granted: I confess it is a negative, and he answers *it is a negative*; and so the Question goes forward apace: and what kind of disputing does he call this? Methinks he might have been contented with my concessions, and not trouble himself to answer what is granted already, and much less to answer so ridiculously, as by the very same concession that I had made to his hands. He adds, *'Tis possible my Lord Anglesey himself told of this to others, though they may be since dead, or are not willing to tell it again.* We are come to a fine pass, when we must argue the matter by *possibilities*; 'tis possible

Vind. p. 13.

possible the Skie may fall, and then we shall catch Larks: however 'twill serve the Reply as well as the Answer, 'tis possible he never told it to others, and I care not much if I add, 'tis probable he never told it, because 'tis probable he never knew it himself. But what does this here? the Question here is not, Whether my Lord *Anglesey*? but Whether the Two Kings told this to others? But I suppose this was intended as an Answer, such as it is, to the former, however he thrust it in here: I find I may pardon his shifting my Exceptions, who makes such work with his own Answers, as to place them at random, and jumble things together that concern two different Questions. But as to the Two Kings he says, *If the Royall Brothers had spoke of it to no body else, it follows not that a Secret was never committed to one, because it was not to more.* Very right, it does not follow necessarily, (and that must be his meaning, or else 'tis nonsense, for I hope he does not think it utterly improbable they might tell it to more, if they told it to one,) and I never said nor thought it did; and therefore this Answer, whatever it is, is nothing to me, nor affects any thing that I have asserted; for it may follow probably enough for all that, that if it was committed to one, it might also be committed to others, and this is all I made of it; and so my Argument stands in full force, let the Answer be never so true in it self, and that is a pure Answer indeed which leaves the Argument in the very same condition it found it: But our Author answers at rovers, and rambles from the Question, and will neither understand it himself, nor suffer his Reader to understand it, or so much as to see it; and I am forc'd to tire the Reader's patience and my own, so often to repeat what he ought to have done; and thus it is in my own words, "I shall leave it with all the world, whether if this was their constant and standing judgment, it is by any means *probable* that they would not one time or other have declar'd the same to some other persons; and consequently, that we should have heard it from some other quarter, and in some better manner than by such a blind Memo-
" *random.*

Vind. p. 13.

" r
it)
the
one
and
no
rid
ba
an

de
in
T
th
B
cl
v
b
P
f
t
c

"*random*. This is a probable Argument; and (as I take it) a very probable one too, and as such I shall leave it to the judgment of the Reader; and our Author hath not said one word to ~~weaken~~ the probability of it in any respect, and out of his abundant tenderness, will neither mention nor answer it; for to say it *does not follow necessarily*, is a ridiculous Answer to an Argument that concludes only *probably*; the Argument is to one thing, and the Answer to another.

But before I leave this head, there is one thing more deserves to be taken notice of; our Author here, and in severall other places, calls this a *Secret*, meaning the Two Kings made a *great Secret* of it; and then I suppose these things will look like Riddles, that the Two Royal Brothers should both of them in the same instant be inclin'd to reveal what they had for several years conceal'd inviolably; and this also without the least hesitation or deliberation in either of them, upon no manner of reason or provocation, on so slight an occasion, and without caution. This I suppose does not look like telling a Secret, but a frank and open declaration of what they did not care if all the world knew; and the *Memorandum* (if it may be credited) plainly intimates that it was told with all possible openness and freedom, and design'd to be spread abroad, rather than be kept as a Secret: And then my Argument concludes yet more probably, that if this was their settled opinion, and they made no Secret of it themselves, in all probability they would have told it to many more; and then instead of having it confin'd to one man's private breast, or lodg'd only in a blind Paper, we should have had it in all men's mouths, and rung through the Kingdom. These Kings were neither of them so happy as to have their most private affairs kept secret; and what they endeavour'd to conceal, was soon divulg'd, not only through the Kingdom, but through the World; and this was not only the fate of their private Speeches or Actions, but of their most secret Counsels too; and it is one of the most unaccountable things in the world, that when their closest Secrets should

be

be disclos'd on the house top, that only should lie hid, and no body know it, which themselves made no Secret at all.

P. 101.

At last he tells us, *We shall presently alleadge more than a presumption, that both the said Kings declar'd their opinion to other People;* and then about fifty Pages after says,

P. 153.

The Royal Brothers said the same to severall others besides my Lord Anglesey; and particularly to some eminent persons now living, who told me so much themselves, with a liberty of mentioning their Names, which after all that has been offer'd, I see no necessity of doing. This is fine and delicate, our Author it seems is grown so very modest, and mealy mouth'd, that he will not take the liberty given him, though it tends more to his advantage (in this part of the Controversie) than any thing he either hath said, or can say; but he that can see no necessity of disproving my Assertions, may at the same time see no necessity of proving his own. However 'tis a little strange, that when he hath hitherto answer'd not one word to the purpose, he will strain courtesie, and not take the liberty to give a good Answer, even when it was ready. I suppose, to make his Book all of a piece, he is so passionately resolv'd against answering me, that he cannot prevail with himself, when he had the fairest opportunity in his hands. In the mean time, it is very pleasant to talk of Names and Testimonies in the Clouds, and especially for him, who slightly turns off two grave and considerable Authors, *We shall hear and examine them, when they'll please to tell us their Names;* and at the same time keeps his own Names and Witnesses in his Pocket. But he that considers what great zeal, and little knowledge, he hath shew'd in this Cause, I suppose will not be over fond of taking his bare word for it.

P. 147.

P. 101.

Having thus dispatch'd what concerns the *Memorandum*, I proceed to consider what he offers to my other Exceptions; which he introduces with this Preface, *By such nice Cavils against the Memorandum.* This, I suppose, we must take to supply the defect of a better Answer; and when

when he hath said nothing, or as good as nothing, to them, it may doe well enough with some Readers to give them hard names, and which to people very well inclin'd may serve instead of the best Answer in the world. But if by *such Cavils*, he means *such* as he hath represented, and pretended to answer, I will never contend with him about them, he may take them to himself; for the Cavils and Answers are all his own, and both equally trifling and impertinent. Well however, By *such nice Cavils* (he tells us) *we can easily judge of the Exceptions we may expect to Dr. Walker's Account*: and then it follows very methodically, *that Gauden hop'd to make a fortune by this Book, &c.* Why, did I ever urge that as an Exception to Dr. Walker's Account? No matter for that, I urg'd it some where or other, and upon some account or other; and 'tis unreasonable to confine men to method and order, especially when the placing the Exceptions in their right order, would shew their force, and strength, and true meaning, which our Author is not dispos'd to doe, and nothing in the world can make him. Here he hath cram'd together things of a different nature, and made use of to different purposes, and placed also under a head to which none of them belong. *That Dr. Gauden hop'd to make a fortune by it, and the immorality of the practice*, were Exceptions to Mr. North's Papers; and the *King's secret intentions, remorse of Conscience, &c.* were urg'd as intrinsic arguments to prove the Book genuine; and here our Author hath rank'd them under *Exceptions to Dr. Walker's account*. A man would imagine he wrote his Answers in loose Papers, and tack'd them together just as they came to hand, without considering whether they belong'd to one thing or another: at this rate we must go to *balloting* for the Controversie, and take the Papers as they arise, after our Author hath jumbled them together; the Reader is likely to be enlightened in the true state of the Case, and to perceive the force of my Exceptions and Proofs, and of his Answers, in such a confused heap: But to place things rightly, and to answer them clearly and distinctly, is not

suitable to the faculties of some Authors, nor to the Cause they maintain. And here I have got a new task, that instead of replying to Answers fairly propos'd, I must first clear my Exceptions and Proofs from that mass of confusion he hath laid them in; and that the Reader may see his way before him, I must separate what he hath huddled together, and fix it in its due order and proper place; and then he may know what it is, and to what purposes used, which is impossible for him to doe, as they ly here obscur'd in disorder and confusion.

That which we are now upon is, *the Exceptions to Dr. Walker's account*; and after I had recited all that concern'd the Question in that account, I made these observations upon it:

*Und. p. 16,
& Seq.*

1. " That all that is material in that account, is resolv'd into the Testimony of Dr. Gauden himself.

2. " That what seems to be otherwise, is of no validity at all, nor can have any force with a rational and wise man: and that because,

1. " It only seems to be something more, but in truth it is not; and those expressions which only seem so are, *That Dr. Gauden shew'd him the heads of divers Chapters, and some of the Discourses written on them, and some time being spent in the perusal*; but in truth are not so, for that Dr. Walker did not see him write them, nor say they were written with his own hand. To this our Author answers, *I believe he is the only man living that questions whether Dr. Walker meant Dr. Gauden's own writing, when he says, that before the whole was finish'd, Dr. Gauden was pleas'd to acquaint him with his design, and shew him the Heads of divers Chapters, with some of the Discourses written on them, and that Mr. Giffard transcrib'd a Copy of it.* But by his favour, the Question is not what he meant, but what he said: meanings are doubtfull things, and the strictness of Evidence is lost, and men cannot support themselves by plain words, when they have recourse to meanings and constructions. That Dr. Walker meant that Dr. Gauden was the Author, no body doubts, but that he meant also

P. 106.

also, the Book was written with his own hand, can never be made out by his words, either directly or by necessary consequence; and I am certain, that all the Evidence that *they* have produc'd on that side, is defective in this point: for as for *Mr. Giffard's transcribing a Copy of it*, our Author makes bold with *Dr. Walker*, and stretches a great deal beyond his meaning; for all that he says is, that *Mr. Giffard* transcrib'd a Copy of it, *if I be not much mistaken*; and he is very fit indeed to interpret *Dr. Walker's meaning*, who makes him assert peremptorily, what he only speaks doubtfully, and with caution and limitation: However, the Reader may perceive already, and much more hereafter, how absolutely necessary it was to unravell his confused web, and to set my Exceptions in their due light and proper places: For the account upon which I urg'd this was to shew, that however it might seem otherwise, yet in truth it was resolv'd into *Dr. Gauden's* own Testimony; and it is a pleasant Answer to that to tell us, *That Dr. Gauden acquainted him with his design*; that is, our Author proves my point instead of answering it, and that is the common effect of confusion; and let *Dr. Walker* mean what he please, let him mean, if he thinks good, that it was in *Dr. Gauden's* hand, the Answer is short and insignificant, except such his meaning would make him also a distinct Evidence to the matter from *Dr. Gauden* himself. Nevertheless, that I may deal fairly, (a method our Author is not acquainted with,) I confess there was a Book written with *Dr. Gauden's* hand, and perhaps *Dr. Walker* might have seen it, and I have (upon good grounds) own'd it sufficiently already, but as it happens, our Author can make no use of it; for if he admits the Testimony, his whole Cause is lost, and the same Evidence that says that there was a Book in *Dr. Gauden's* hand writing, says also that he was not the Author, but the Transcriber; and he must take all or none: nevertheless my observation stands equally firm with and without it, that whatsoever is in *Dr. Walker's* Account, is ultimately resolv'd into *Dr. Gauden's* Testimony; and the Consequence is certain and un-

Dr. Walker's Account, p. 5.

denyable, that whereas there are several other material circumstances, which not only fortifie a Testimony of this nature, but make it a direct Evidence of it self; as the seeing the Author proceed with it from time to time, seeing corrections and alterations with his own hand; and when those who were the most intimate with Dr. *Gauden*, who liv'd in his house, and were (as they tell us) privy to the Secret, could not say one word to this; when neither Dr. *Walker's* Account, nor Mrs. *Gauden's* Papers, have the least syllable tending to this, and when at the same time we have all this, and more, for King *Charles's* being the Author; when no man ever saw Dr. *Gauden* make any progress in it, add to, or amend it, and when all this is directly and positively asserted of King *Charles*, 'tis a pleasant business that an Evidence so plain and direct in it self, and so full as to all necessary circumstances, must be confronted by that which hath nothing at all of this, and which in it self is no direct Evidence at all, but only a relative Evidence to another Evidence, and which other Evidence also is good for nothing. Our Author here tells us, *that this is all that can be said of any Author in the world*; that is, that Dr. *Gauden* acquainted him with his design, and shew'd him some of the Heads and Chapters written on them: Now if that be all that can be said of any Author in the world, then most certainly King *Charles* was the Author of this Book; for there is all this, and a great deal more too, even the seeing him write it, seeing the progress he made in it, seeing corrections and alterations with his own hand; and I hope that is well proved, and beyond exception, which hath *all*, and more than all, to support it.

But I now come to an Exception indeed, and which our Author will by no means meddle with least it burn his fingers, which turns hard upon Dr. *Walker*, and affects all that he says in this Cause; the other made his Testimony lame, but this makes it false; and that is,

2. " This Evidence Dr. *Walker* hath contradicted himself, " in another Testimony of his in the hands of Dr. *Goodall*, " and

“ and given *March 23. 1690.* in these words, *Dr. Walker and* *Vind. p. 19.*
 “ *Mr. Giffard were both privy to these affairs, living together*
 “ *in the Bishop's house, though the Dr. is uncertain whether*
 “ *he ever read the Book in manuscript, or only saw it with its*
 “ *Title of the Chapters :* But about a year after, when *Dr.*
 “ *Hollingworth* had anger'd him, *Dr. Gauden* did not on-
 “ ly shew him the Heads, and Discourses, but *after some*
 “ *time spent in the perusal, he vouchsafed to ask my opinion*
 “ *concerning it ;* so that here is not only reading it, but
 “ reading it for some time ; and so reading it, as to give an
 “ opinion and judgment concerning it : and to shew how
 “ well he remembered this, he tells us the very opinion he
 “ gave to *Dr. Gauden* about it ; and farther yet he adds, *I Dr. Wal-*
 “ *perfectly remember that in the second Chapter, which is of* *ker's Ac-*
 “ *the Death of the Earl of Strafford, there being these* *count, p. 4.*
 “ *words,* He only hath been least vext by them, who coun-
 “ celled me not to consent against the vote of my con-
 “ science ; and which (he says) *Dr. Gauden told him he*
 “ *meant it of Bishop Juxton :* so that here we have *peru-*
 “ *sing the Book,* and that not transiently, but for *some time,*
 “ and *perfectly remembring* the subject matter of one Chap-
 “ ter, and an intire sentence in that Chapter, with a particu-
 “ lar explication relating to it. This is very consistent with his
 “ *being uncertain whether he ever read the Book in manuscript,*
 “ *or only saw it with its Title of the Chapters :* he is *uncer-*
 “ *tain,* and very certain ; he *remembers not,* and he *per-*
 “ *fectly remembers* the same things in the same story ; an
 “ excellent Evidence indeed, and much to be relied on, who
 “ interferes with himself, and contradicts his own Testi-
 “ mony. And this I take to be a very considerable Ex-
 “ ception to *Dr. Walker's Account,* (and so I suppose will all
 “ men else,) and which affects his whole Testimony, and
 “ prejudices every thing he hath said in this Cause ; for there
 “ is nothing more lessens the credibility of a Witness, than
 “ his contradicting himself, and telling two contrary stories
 “ of the same thing ; and it seems our Author is very well
 “ contented it should be so, for he hath not one word to say
 “ to it, nor takes the least notice as if any such Exception
 “ had.

had been made. This is a new way of answering Exceptions: methinks (if he could say nothing else,) he might have taken his own method, and told us (as he did once before) that it was in 90 when he said this, but it was 92, two years after that he wrote his account, and therefore by *his good leave it does not follow* that he contradicted himself: In the mean time, 'tis a gross imposing on the world, to tell them he answers Exceptions, and at the same time never so much as name them. And here we see the artifice of jumbling together things foreign to one another, on purpose to blind his Reader's eyes, that he may not perceive that he hath slunk away the most material Exception; for had he set them in their own order, either he must not have omitted it, or if he had, it would have been easily discovered; but he thought it might escape well enough in the croud, and pass unobserv'd when as he had ordered the matter, no body knew where to find it; but I have brought it to light again, and crave leave to tell him, that 'tis a great blot upon Dr. Walker's Account, and 'till he takes care to clear it, as such it will remain, and as such a blot too, which discredits the whole, and makes his Testimony of no value as contradictory to it self.

But this is not all, there is one thing more I had observ'd, to shew the Reader what weight there is to be laid on Dr. Walker's assertions; he says, *I am as sure as I can be of any thing, that Dr. Gauden made the Extract out of this Book call'd Apothegmata Carolina*; and yet he is perfectly and notoriously mistaken, for Dr. Hooker was the Author of that Book, and not Dr. Gauden; and for the proof of this, besides Mr. Long's Testimony, (which I had mention'd before,) I have my self seen a Letter from Dr. Hooker to Dr. Goodall, in which he owns himself to be the Author; and moreover gives an account, that at first he had made it much larger, but afterwards contracted it to a pocket Book which he calls a *Vade mecum*. Now, in my poor opinion, this bears exceeding hard upon Dr. Walker, and extremely lessens the credit of his asseverations with all wise men. For if a man can say, and deliberately print,

Dr. Walker's Account, p. 8.

print, *I am as sure as I can be of any thing*, (and that one would think is sure enough, and as much assurance as a man can give,) of a most certain and notorious falsehood, that man's assurances signifie nothing, except it be to assure the world that his word, how solemn soever, is not to be trusted: I am sure Dr. *Walker* cannot affirm with greater confidence, that Dr. *Gauden* was the Author of the *Icon*, than he does that he was the Author of the *Apothegmata*; and one is manifestly false, and by that let any man judge of the other. Nothing is more apparent than that this confident assertion, uttered with the utmost degree of assurance, shakes the credit of his whole Book, and takes off the edge and force of all his asseverations. And what doth our Author say to this? what hath he to offer to uphold the credit of his Witness? why, let Dr. *Walker's* credit sink or swim, 'tis all one to him, he is not to concern himself in these dangerous matters; he is hardned against meddling with any thing that is material, and hath serv'd this just as the other, and (by a way of answering peculiar to himself,) hath not said one word to it.

We now come to those commonly call'd Mr. *North's* Papers: And the first thing our Author takes notice of is, those expressions in my Lord Chancellor *Hyde's* Letter, *The particular you mention, has indeed been imparted to me as a Secret; I am sorry I ever knew it, and when it ceases to be a Secret, it will please none but Mr. Milton.* To this I had said, "Was there no other Secret in the world" but this, that the divulging of it would gratifie Mr. *Milton*? And to this he answers, *Yes doubtless; but I believe* p. 107. *not one that would please none but Mr. Milton, as the Chancellor expresses it.* Very good: and what does he mean by *None*? If he takes it strictly and grammatically, (as he seems to doe,) for no Person in the world besides Mr. *Milton*, the Answer is both ridiculous and against himself; for our Author and his Party perfectly confutes it; and my Lord Chancellor knew well, that at that time there were enow, and too many, who would be gratified with

with such a Secret, as the King's not being the Author of that Book; and therefore (according to his interpretation) that could not be the Secret which my Lord Chancellor meant, because that was not appropriated to his person, but extended to all the Regicides, and impenitent Rebels, and their abettors; and though it might please him, yet others would be pleas'd with it too, as well as he: So that if our Author insists strictly upon this term *none*, his Answer undermines it self; and whatever else the Secret might be, it is impossible it should be this that my Lord Chancellor meant in his Letter. However, let it mean Mr. *Milton* alone and singly, or let it mean him with others, or what he please, 'tis all one to me, my Answer is the same, These are mysticall expressions, and prove nothing; and tho my Lord Chancellor and Dr. *Gauden* might understand them well enough, yet no body else can, and much less draw any argument or proof from them; for whatever, that Secret was, my Lord Chancellor's meaning is no less a Secret; and to argue from such things, is to grope in the dark, and to dispute by Prophecie. But our Author hath a Reason, *For he (Mr. Milton) having particularly question'd the genuineness of this Book, and offer'd a fair proof of the spuriousness thereof, from intrinsic Evidence only, without any farther light, would be extremely pleas'd to find his reasonings and judgment confirm'd by undeniable matters of fact.* Well, this is a Reason that such a discovery would gratifie Mr. *Milton*, which no body doubts; but it is no Reason to prove that That was my Lord Chancellor's meaning, which is the only thing to be proved: Our Author was much at leisure sure to give Reasons why Mr. *Milton* would be pleas'd; there is no question but he would be pleas'd with that, and with a great many other things too, as bad as that; but our Author is very free of his Reasons upon all occasions but such as need it. The Question here is not, upon what Reasons Mr. *Milton* would be pleas'd, whether upon these or any other, or none at all; but what were the Reasons that induc'd my Lord Chancellor to make use of those Expressions? and except

cept our Author can tell that, his Answer is benighted, and hath lost its way; he hath made some Reasons for Mr. *Milton*, but except he can make some for my Lord Chancellor too, he says nothing, nor speaks to the Case before us.

But whatever might be the meaning of those Expressions, that my Lord Chancellor did not by them mean the Secret of Dr. *Gauden's* being the Author of this Book, I had produc'd an undeniable and satisfactory proof, from a Letter I had the honour to receive from the Right Honourable the present Earl of *Clarendon*, my Lord Chancellor's Son, containing, among other things, " That his Lordship preparing to attend his Father in *France*, in the beginning of the Summer 1674. his Lordship went first to *Farnham*, to the late Bishop of *Winton*; and among severall things he had in charge from the Bishop to his Father, he bad him tell him, that the King had very ill people about him, who turn'd all things into ridicule; that they endeavour'd to bring him to have a mean opinion of his Father, and to persuade him that he was not the Author of the Book which goes under his Name: And (when after his Lordship's arrival in *France*, he had deliver'd his Father these particulars among others,) to that concerning the Book, his Father reply'd, *Good God! I thought the Marquis of Hartford had satisfied the King in that matter.* From hence (our Author says, and says truly,) I would infer, that my Lord Chancellor did not believe any other besides King *Charles* the First to be the Author, and that he wondred any should go about to persuade King *Charles* the Second to question it. This is the first time our Author hath represented my sense fairly, and I thank him for it, and should be glad to encourage him; and if he will continue to doe so, I shall never find fault with him, let him him make his Answers as strong as he can, and the stronger the better. And thus it follows, *But for my part, P. 110. I think it very plain on the contrary, that he believed King Charles the First not to be the Author, and wondered that King Charles the Second should not understand so much from the Marquis of Hartford: who as Dr. Walker and Mrs. Gauden*

den inform us, *was the person that carried the Manuscript to the King in the Isle of Wight; and next to Dr. Gauden himself, was best able to convince his Son of the truth.* This our Author saith is *very plain to him*, which I have nothing to doe to question; but before it can be made plain to others, he ought to have shewed the connexion and coherence that is between this and the information given to my Lord Chancellor, and to what part of the information this sense of the words is directed; for I suppose our Author will not deny, that this *wonder and surprize* was occasion'd by what was then told to his Lordship. And thus it is according to our Author, my Lord Clarendon informs his Father, that there were *very ill people endeavouring to persuade the King that his Father was not the Author of the Book*; upon which my Lord Chancellor falls into a passionate exclamation, *that the Marquis of Hartford had not inform'd the King before, and saved those ill people the labour.* This is a very sad thing, and much to be admir'd. My Lord Chancellor is inform'd that there were very ill people about the King, acting suitable to their character, and endeavouring to persuade him to two very bad things; first to have a mean opinion of his Father, and in order to that, to persuade him that he was not the Author of his Book; and now comes our Author and makes his Lordship so full of admiration, as to justify and confirm their ill practices: *Good God!* that there should be so much iniquity in the world, and such ill people as to persuade the King to a matter, and he not understand the same before from my Lord Marquis. This is indeed wonderfully surprizing; but 'tis that any man should make such a construction of his Lordship's expressions: And by his favour, these expressions denote not only a surprize, but a resentment also, and aversion in his Lordship to what was then told him; and this makes our Author's interpretation yet more pleasant, his Lordship expresses a great dislike and dissatisfaction of what was then told him, and in the same breath confirms it: He wonders that wicked people should undertake to persuade the King, and wonders

ders too, that the King was not already persuaded by the Lord Marquis, who (according to our Author,) was the next best person able to convince him. But why the next best, and not the best of all? Our Author contends that Dr. Gauden inform'd my Lord Chancellor of the Secret, and he was convinc'd by him; and why did not his Lordship name him to satisfy the King, rather than the Lord Marquis? Our Author says *the Marquis of Hartford, next to Dr. Gauden himself, was best able*; but if Dr. Gauden satisfied his Lordship himself, and was best able too to satisfy the King, why should not the wonder have been that Dr. Gauden had not inform'd the King? Well, however that be, our Author forgets that he is contradicting the very thing he contends for: He would here persuade us, that those expressions in my Lord Chancellor's Letter mean that his Lordship was acquainted with the Secret of Dr. Gauden's being the Author; and yet (whatever that Secret was) his Lordship does not speak very favourably of it: *I am sorry I ever knew it, and when it ceases to be a Secret, it will please none but Mr. Milton.* But here it seems, and (as our Author would have it,) upon the same Secret too, he makes his Lordship wonderfully surpriz'd and concern'd, that the King should not understand it.

In the mean time, it may not be unusefull to observe the design those *ill men* had in *endeavouring to persuade the King that his Father was not the Author*, which was to bring him to have *a mean opinion of his Father*; this was the end of those attempts upon the King, and 'tis the very same that is still prosecuted, and by the same means. The Book must be blasted for the sake of its Author, and the memory of that incomparable Prince is to partake of the aspersions cast upon his Works, and therefore they go allways hand in hand together; those who fall upon the Book, are as foul upon his Person and Memory, and would fain make his Vertues spurious, as well as his Book; they care not who was the Author, and I dare say, would immediately quit the Controversie, provided they could persuade the world to have an ill opinion of him, and exting-

tinguish the horror of his Martyrdom. And when the *King's Image* is the Image of his Vertues too, when there are so many full streams of piety running quite through it, this is the grand objection, and not to be endur'd; they have painted him a Monster, of the foulest lineaments and proportions, and therefore will not suffer that Picture of his own Soul, which is so exceeding lovely and beautiful, to be drawn by his own hand. But should the Regicides have gain'd their point, and intirely stifled this Book, and should these men succeed in their attempts, and rob him of the honour of it, there are besides remaining so many noble monuments of his vertue and piety, as would be abundantly sufficient to transmit to posterity the glory of his name, and the impiety of his murther; his Bloud would lye still as heavy on their hands, and complicated with the same execrable additions of murthering an excellent Prince, and a very holy and innocent man. But to return.

Those expressions of my Lord Chancellor are plain enough, and it requires a great deal more difficulty to mistake, than not to apprehend them; and there needs no more than putting the Information and the Answer together: The Information is, *there were very ill people about the King, who endeavour'd to persuade him that his Father was not the Author*; the Answer is, *Good God! I thought the Marquis of Hartford had satisfied the King in that matter.* And what now does this surprize refer to? Apparently to the practices of those ill people; and my Lord Chancellor expressed his wonder and resentment, that those ill people should have the confidence to persuade the King that his Father was not the Author, when his Lordship had all the reason in the world to believe that the Marquis of *Hartford* had long before satisfied the King that his Father was the Author. This is not only an easy and natural construction of the words, but 'tis impossible there should be any other, and preserve the sense intire, and consistent with that Information given to his Lordship. But that I might give all satisfaction

in this case, I made bold to write to the Right Honourable the present Earl of *Clarendon*, and humbly desired, in what sense his Lordship took those words of his Father; (and certainly no person so fit to interpret the meaning, as the same who gave the information, and with whom was the discourse;) and his Lordship was pleased to doe me the honour to write me an Answer; which being so very full to the point in hand, together with other excellent observations relating to the matter, I humbly beg his Lordship's pardon for making it publick. His Lordship's Letter follows *verbatim*.

May the 5. 1699.

Sir,

I would not answer your Letter of the 29th of the last Month till I had read Amyntor, (the Pamphlet you mention,) which truly I had not done when I receiv'd it. And now I have read it, I cannot but stand amazed at the impudence of the Author, for the construction he makes of what my Father said, upon what I told him from the Bishop of Winchester, (Dr. Morley,) speaking of the endeavours were used to possess King Charles the Second with a mean opinion of his Father, and that he was not the Author of the Book which goes under his name: The words were these, Good God! (said my Father,) I thought the Marquis of Hartford had satisfied the King in that matter. I confess, I understood these words in a quite different sense from the Author of Amyntor; namely, that my Father thought the Marquis of Hartford had satisfied King Charles the Second that his Father was the Author of that Book which goes under his name; and the rather, because I never heard my Father let fall the least word, as if he doubted the King's being the Author of that Book. I cannot but observe that Mrs. Gauden in her Narrative printed in Amyntor, says that her Husband meeting with Dr. Morley, he fell into discourse how sensible he was of the great services which he had done his present Majesty, and the Royal Family, in composing

composing and setting forth that excellent piece called the King's Book. *If this were true, that Bishop Morley knew that Bishop Gauden had composed the King's Book, and that he had acquainted Sir Edward Hyde with it (as the Narrative says,) I leave it to you, or any one, to judge whether it were possible that Bishop Morley could hold that discourse with me which I have mention'd: Every body then knew the intimacy and friendship I had with that good Bishop, and he very well knew how intirely I was trusted by my Father; so that 'twas impossible the Bishop could make that complaint to me of the endeavours used to persuade the King, that his Father was not the Author of the Book which goes under his name, if he had known or believed that Bishop Gauden had composed it: and I am confident my Father would have laugh'd at the Bishop of Winchester for sending such an errand by me, if he had believ'd Bishop Gauden to have been the Author of that Book; and I do verily believe my Father would have told me upon that occasion, if he had had the least intimation that Bishop Gauden had composed it. I wish what I have here told you may be satisfactory to you, or of any use to the honest Cause you defend. I am, Sir,*

Your, &c.

Clarendon.

And now I suppose the Reader is abundantly satisfied, and that not only in the particular case before us, but also of other points very material in this Controversie; and 'tis from hence exceedingly clear and convincing, not only what was the true sense of my Lord Chancellor's expressions, but also that neither my Lord Chancellor, nor Bishop Morley, knew or believ'd the least tittle of Dr. Gauden's being the Author of this Book; and this perfectly confutes both our Author's interpretation of these expressions, and of those in my Lord Chancellor's Letter, and also Mrs. Gauden's Narrative, But I shall not need to remark any thing from my Lord Clarendon's Letter, which is so very full and satisfactory of it self, and therefore I proceed.

Our

Our Author to confirm his interpretation tells us, that *the Marquis of Hartford, as Dr. Walker and Mrs. Gauden inform us, was the person who carried the Manuscript to the King in the Isle of Wight, and so next to Dr. Gauden, best able to convince his Son.* Now if the interpretation of my Lord Chancellor's surprize before set down be true, (and I will leave it with any Reader in the world,) then it follows, that *Dr. Walker's and Mrs. Gauden's informations are both false.* The Marquis of *Hartford* never carried such a Manuscript to the *Isle of Wight*, and my Lord Chancellor knew that his Lordship's abilities tended the other way, and he was well able to convince the King that his Father was the Author. However our Author adds, *Moreover, how could the Bishop of Winton imagine the ill people about Charles II. could bring him to doubt of his Father's being the Author, if he really knew it to be written by him? when upon this supposition, he was rather capable of satisfying all those who had any scruples in this affair.* Well, whatever the Bishop might imagine, I am sure our Author's imagination is extremely wild; it seems with him 'tis very unaccountable that *ill people* should go about to persuade the King to any matter contrary to his knowledge or belief; I suppose because Kings are the securest people in the world, and have neither flatterers nor hypocrites about them: But when such pests are allways hovering about Majesty, and make no manner of scruple to persuade Kings contrary to what they know themselves, 'tis very much indeed that they should dare to offer any thing contrary to their belief: And the very character of the persons sufficiently accounts for this; they were *ill people*, and consequently stuck at nothing, how base, unreasonable or false soever; and it is a strange thing it seems, that the Bishop of *Winton* should imagine that *ill people* should doe *ill* things. But whatever may be said of the people, how could the Bishop imagine that these *ill people* should gain their point, and *bring the King to doubt, when the King himself could have satisfied them to the contrary?* But this imagination is all his own, there is not one word of the King's

King's doubting, or any thing like it, in the Bishop's message, which relates nothing at all to any effect it had, or was like to have on the King, but only to the *endeavours of those ill people*; but he can represent nothing fairly. However since we are upon *imaginations*, I have something to exercise his faculty upon, and in order to that I make bold to repeat my Lord *Clarendon's* observation out of Mrs. *Gauden's* Narrative, and to add something to his Lordship's excellent remarks upon it, and in pag. 122. of his own Book, he will find these words, *And Dr. Gauden meeting with Dr. Morley, he fell into discourse how sensible he was of the great service he had done his present Majesty and the Royal Family, in composing and setting forth that excellent peice call'd the King's Book; and afterwards, Dr. Morley also told him, that he had acquainted Sir Edward Hyde with the business, and that he did very much commend and admire it.* And to make this matter yet surer, she tells, that this discourse with Dr. *Morley* encourag'd her Husband to proceed in the business, and to speak to Dr. *Sheldon* &c. Here we have (according to Mrs. *Gauden*,) Dr. *Morley* owning to Dr. *Gauden* himself his knowledge that he was the Author, and the great services he had thereby done to the Crown; and farther the same Dr. *Morley* acquainting my Lord Chancellor with it, and that his Lordship very much commended it. And now let our Author or any Man else imagine,

1. Whether Bishop *Morley* could represent those as *very ill men*, and consequently those *very ill practices*, which tended to persuade the King *that his Father was not the Author*, if he himself knew it to be certainly true.

2. Whether Bishop *Morley* could send such a *mock message* to any person in the world, and much less to a person of Honour, and by a person of my Lord *Clarendon's* character and quality.

3. Whether he could send this, especially to my Lord Chancellor, if it was Bishop *Morley* himself who acquainted my Lord Chancellor that Dr. *Gauden* was the Author.

Author. This is sending scorns and affronts, instead of a serious, and indeed a very passionate message.

4. Whether, if this were true, my Lord Chancellor's surprise and resentment would not have operated the contrary way, that Bishop *Morley* should send him a message in a manner contradictory to his own particular information to his Lordship.

5. Whether this does not directly contradict our Author's interpretation of that *Secret* mention'd in my Lord Chancellor's Letter: there his Lordship speaks of it with great disgust and dissatisfaction, *I am sorry I ever knew it*; but here, it seems, *he did very much commend and admire it*. And therefore,

6. Whether (upon the whole) *Mrs. Gauden's Narrative* be not all dream and imagination, the product of vapors and the spleen, and hath no real foundation in the world.

We come now to consider some other Expressions mention'd in those Papers, from a Petition of Dr. *Gauden's* to the King, and a Letter of his to the Duke of *York*; which our Author thus represents, *As for Dr. Gauden's great service, and his saying in a Letter to the Chancellor, that what was done like a King should have a King-like retri-* P. 110.
bution, Mr. W. says these are mystical expressions, and that by them he might probably mean a Book he wrote against the Covenant, and a Protestation he publish'd against the King's death, neither of which could be term'd such extraordinary services, when many others had done the same and more; much less could it be said that either of those Books was done like a King, or deserv'd a King-like retri-
bution. And here we have our Author at the old trade again, of misrepresenting my Answer, and leaving behind him all the force of it: Any man who reads this, would think that it extended only to those two Books, whereas my Answer is general, and does not refer to those two Books in particular, which I added only (at the latter end) by way of conjecture; and whether that conjecture be true or false, my Answer is the same, independent on it, and not relative to it: In these words, " Were there no Vinl. p. 20.

" other services that Dr. *Gauden* had done besides ? or at
 " least that he might plead, whether he had done them or
 " not ? Was it not possible for Dr. *Gauden* to have, or pre-
 " tended to have done like a King, *i.e.* freely and magnifi-
 " cently (as that Scripture expression means in the case
 " of *Araunab*) but this single instance ? And need our Au-
 " thor be told wherein the force of this Answer consists ?
 There are general Expressions in Dr. *Gauden's* Petition and
 Letter, which the Advocates on that side will needs have
 to mean writing the Book ; and the Answer is, what ne-
 cessity is there for that, seeing there might be other ser-
 vices which Dr. *Gauden* actually had done, or at least might
 pretend it ? And whoever will answer that, must shew that
 Dr. *Gauden* neither did, nor could pretend to any other,
 or that those Expressions directly, or by necessary implica-
 tion, mean the being the Author of that Book, which 'tis
 impossible for them to doe : For by what construction does
great services mean nothing else but composing that very
 Book ? and why does *doing like a King* mean writing a
 Book in the King's name ? for those very expressions (from
 2 Sam. 24. whence Dr. *Gauden* borrowed them) mean quite other-
 23. wise ; for I hope *Araunab's* offering to give to King *David*
 a Treshing-floor and materials for Sacrifice, did not mean
 personating him, and counterfeiting his name ; but they
 mean, and mean only, giving freely and generously without
 being paid for them, or expecting any retribution or re-
 compense : But the services Dr. *Gauden* had done, or
 might plead he had done, though he never did them, what-
 ever he pretended, were not done *like a King*, but *like a*
mercenary, for he not only expected, but was clamorous for
 a reward. But this, it seems, was out of our Author's
 province, he is for letting the Answer alone, to stand or
 fall at the mercy of the Reader ; and instead of that
 spends his time in picking up something here and there, and
 flourishing upon them, but even then will not give a satis-
 factory Answer : For as to those two Books, and the pro-
 bability of that being the plea Dr. *Gauden* made to the
 King, our Author thus answers, *Those could not be termed*
such

such extraordinary services, when many others had done the same, and more; as if nothing could be called *extraordinary*, because the like or better had been done by several others, whereas *extraordinary* is opposed to *ordinary, common, usuall*, and whatsoever is out of the common road may be termed extraordinary. Suppose I should say our Author here gives an extraordinary Answer, (and that term is equally applicable to mean as to great services;) will he think to discharge himself, by saying others have given as bad or worse? However, that is not Dr. Gauden's Expression, but he terms them *Great Services*; and I hope a man may think his own services great enough, without any diminution to others, who have done as great or greater: And indeed the true way of construing those Expressions, is not to try them by the strictest sense the words will bear, but by considering them as coming from Dr. Gauden himself, as being his own representation of his own merits; and then I suppose they may be interpreted with some grains of allowance: Here he himself, for want of a better, was pleading his own merits for preferment, and I hope a little Rhetorick may be allow'd in such cases, and a man may make the best of his own Cause; and therefore I will grant our Author, that neither of those two Books, nor any other of Dr. Gauden's services were *extraordinary, or King-like*, if you are resolv'd to take those words in a strict sense; but if a man may be admitted to be his own Orator, I cannot say but those, and a great many other epithets as fair as they, may be ascrib'd to far less performances than either of those two Books.

In the mean time, and as an addition to our Author's great exactness, here are two other very material things, which he hath totally passed over, and does not think them worth the naming;

1. That if all they alleadge were admitted, if those expressions did in truth mean that he was the Author, it would be only the single Testimony of Dr. Gauden himself; but this is a point he hath allways industriously avoided, and will not be prevail'd with to speak one word

to it, though it concerns the Cause he pretends to maintain, as much at least, if not a great deal more, than any thing he hath taken notice of. But I shall have occasion hereafter to take more particular notice of his gross omissions in this kind.

2. "That this plainly contradicts Dr. *Walker's* Evidence, which is, that Dr. *Gauden* told him *he could not positively and certainly say, that King Charles the second knew that he wrote the Book*; and it would look very ridiculous to present a petition to that King, and to use it as an instance to recommend him to his favour, that in behalf of the Royal Family, *he had done like a King*, meaning he had writ the Book, and at the same time *not know* whether that King knew he was the Author of it. Now all this stands just before those things our Author hath mentioned, and I hope 'tis no immodest question to ask how they came to escape him? are Contradictions such small things as not to be worth the reconciling? But I find Dr. *Walker* is but little beholding to him, for let him contradict himself, or let him contradict Dr. *Gauden*, (as he interprets him,) 'tis all one to him, he will afford him no help; and except there be some other charitable person to remove those rubs out of the way, there they must lye for our Author; 'tis enough for him to tell a few stories, and to mangle the Cause, let other people take care of the Arguments and Contradictions. Well, though our Author hath forgot these, it may be there are other Contradictions he can turn his hand to; and this is the next thing:

The Contradictions between Dr. *Walker's* Account and Mrs. *Gauden's* Narrative. *It is objected* (saith he) *that Dr. Walker's and Mrs. Gauden's Testimonies contradict one another, but how? Dr. Walker says that Dr. Gauden told him, he did not know if King Charles the First had seen the Book; but Mrs. Gauden affirms, that the Marquis of Hartford told her Husband the King had seen and approv'd it.* This is our Author's representation of the matter, but how lamely and imperfectly, and like himself, we shall see

see presently, but first let us take his Answer: *Both which assertions are consistent enough together, for Dr. Gauden might be ignorant that the King had seen it when Dr. Walker ask'd him that Question, who perhaps never mention'd it to him again in their discourses about this matter, or might easily forget it, as he says he did several other particulars, little foreseeing he should ever be oblig'd to make this discovery; and besides, we must upon all accounts allow his Wife to know more circumstances of this business, as of most others, than his friend.* Well, I perceive our Author is allways for reconciling Contradictions by Chronology, but he hath the worst hand at it that ever I saw: Dr. Gauden (saith he) *might be ignorant of it when Dr. Walker ask'd him that Question.* Now here are two things to be inquired into, First, When Dr. Gauden is said to have known that the King saw it, and approv'd it; and Secondly, When Dr. Walker ask'd him the Question: And as to the first, Mrs. Gauden's Narrative informs us, and after the recital of the information given him by the Marquis of Hartford adds, *upon this* P. 118. *(i. e. upon the Marquis's telling him all the discourse with the King,) my Husband told my Lord Marquis, that in his opinion there was no way so probable to save his Majesty's life, as by endeavouring to move the hearts, &c. and that he thought that that Book would be effectual to that purpose. Then my Lord bad him doe what he would. ----- Then immediately my Husband resolv'd to print it with all speed, ----- only he then added the Essay upon their denying his Majesty the attendance of his Chaplains, and the Meditation of Death after the Votes of Non-addresses.* So that here we have three periods of time, and each of them sufficient for our purpose; 'twas before his Majesty's death, before the Book was sent to the Press, and before the addition of two Chapters. Next let us enquire when Dr. Walker ask'd him the Question, and that Dr. Walker tells us in express terms in these words, *Dr. Gauden some time after the King was murther'd, upon my asking him whether the King had ever seen the Book, gave me this Answer, I know it certainly no more than you: So that when Dr. Walker* ask'd

Dr. Walker's Account, p. 34.

ask'd the Question, and receiv'd the Answer, *it was some time after the King's murther*, and that's a considerable time after the Marquis inform'd Dr. Gauden that the King had seen and approv'd it, according to Mrs. Gauden; so that our Author hath fairly compromis'd the business: Dr. Gauden *might be ignorant that the King had seen it when Dr. Walker ask'd the Question*, meaning a Month or two after he had been told it; a very fair reconciliation, and the assertions very consistent: our Author had as good have drop'd this Contradiction as well as the other, except he could have found some better Answer to it. But our Author to supply and help this out, hath another Answer, or (Dr. Walker) *might easily forget it, as he says he did several other particulars*. Forget what? Why, when Dr. Gauden told him: But Dr. Walker is as positive to the time as to the thing, and if he forgot one he might forget the other too, and by the same reason he hath forgot all his Book; and 'tis nothing else but the effect of a bad memory, which I shall readily grant; and our Author's reason helps the matter much, *as he says he did severall other particulars*; that is, because Dr. Walker forgot what he did not mention, therefore he also forgot what he hath mention'd; and if a man forgets what he does not say and what he does say too, he is an excellent Evidence, and of extraordinary credit. Sure our Author owes Dr. Walker a spite, he treats him so courly at every turn; he suffers him to contradict himself, Dr. Gauden, and Mrs. Gauden, and at last hath made him to forget his own Testimony. But there is another Answer yet behind, *We must upon all accounts allow his Wife to know more circumstances of this business, as of most others, than his friend*: Very well, and let that be allow'd, but I suppose no body will allow upon any account that she knew *contradictory circumstances*; and the Question is not whether she or Dr. Walker knew more or less of the business, but whether they both knew what is contradictory in the same business; and it is a fine business indeed, which will admit of two persons knowing contradictions about it. Dr. Walker (if he may be

be believ'd) knew that after the King's murther, Dr. *Gauden* knew no more than himself, whether the King had ever seen it; but Mrs. *Gauden* (if she may be believ'd) knew the clean contrary, that her Husband long before knew that the King had both seen and approv'd it. Now this Testimony having but one small encumbrance upon it, that 'tis utterly impossible; I suppose all indifferent men will conclude that neither of them knew any thing of the matter.

Before I go any farther, I must undertake the task our Author allways sets me, and recite the material omissions he hath made of the Contradictions that relate to this branch of the Evidence, and such also as do directly and in plain terms confute his Answer.

In Mrs. *Gauden's* Evidence, the Marquis told her Husband *the King liked it well, and asked whether it could not be put out in some other name*; and the Narrative says *that Bishop Duppa read some of the Essays to him*: In Dr. *Walker's*, Dr. *Gauden* ventur'd to print it, and never knew what was the issue of sending it. So that here we have not only a gross Contradiction, but withall, a perfect confutation of our Author's Chronology; for *when* was it that Dr. *Gauden* never knew the issue? why, when he ventur'd to print it: and yet Mrs. *Gauden* says, that all that information from the Marquis, was not only before the actual sending to the Press, but before he had taken any resolution to doe it; *Then* (says she) *immediately my Husband resolv'd to print it with all speed*. Then, that is, after the Marquis had told him the whole transaction with the King, and Dr. *Gauden* had given his opinion upon it, *my Lord bad my Husband to doe what he would, in regard the case was desperate*; and then he resolv'd to print it, upon that liberty the Lord Marquis had given him. So that according to Dr. *Walker*, he ventur'd to print it, and never knew what was the issue of sending it; according to Mrs. *Gauden*, he was compleatly inform'd of the whole matter, and had my Lord Marquis's leave, before he resolv'd to print it: and in farther confirmation of this,

P. 118.

Dr. *Walker*

Dr. Walker adds, *when the thing was done, he judged it not prudent to make any farther noise about it by inquiry*; which is another perfect contradiction to all and every thing that Mrs. Gauden says on this head, and as perfect a confutation of our Author; for, *when the thing was done*, that is, when the Book was printed. So that from first to last, he knew nothing of what the Marquis said to the King, or the King to the Marquis; and thought it moreover the wisest course to keep himself still in ignorance, least he should make too much noise about it; but according to Mrs. Gauden, there was neither need of his *prudence* or *inquiry*, for all the noise had been made already, and he had been fully inform'd of the whole matter. But these are things our Author will by no means take notice of, although an indifferent person will be apt to think they need some of his help; but here his Chronology fails him, and he hath nothing else to say, and therefore 'tis better to follow Dr. Gauden's prudence, and *make no noise about it*.

Our Author goes on, *The next supposed Contradiction is, that Dr. Walker says Dr. Gauden once told him after the Restauration, that he did not positively and certainly know if King Charles the Second knew he wrote Icon Basilike, though he believ'd he might, because the Duke of York did, and own'd it to have been a seasonable and acceptable service: But Mrs. Gauden affirms, that her Husband acquainted the King with it himself, which is very true: but pray let us examine at what time; after his discourse with Dr. Walker, most certainly; for doth she not in clear and direct terms say, that it was in his last sickness, which prov'd mortal to him? and the reason was, because some persons desir'd to have it concealed, to which he was not willing, by reason of his numerous family &c.* Now here our Author strains hard to accommodate matters, and bring both ends together; but he takes the worst course in the world, and prevaricates both with Dr. Walker and Mrs. Gauden, to peice their Testimony, and make them consistent; for to clear that peremptory assertion, that Dr. Gauden

Gauden acquainted the King, (affirm'd by Mrs. Gauden,) was after that discourse with Dr. Walker, most certainly; he adds, for does she not in clear and direct terms say that it was in his last sickness, which prov'd mortal to him? I answer, No indeed, she does not; for to say it in direct terms is (as I take it) to say it in those terms, or at least in terms directly implying it; but she neither expresses it in those terms, nor in the sense those terms are commonly taken; and all that she does say is, *that God* P. 124. *visited her Husband with an infirmity, which he had great cause to fear would (as it did) prove mortal to him:* But then it was such an infirmity, as neither hindred him from conversing with his friends, or following his affairs; but that would not doe, and therefore it is to be called his *last sickness*, as if it had been upon his Death-bed, and Dr. Walker had no opportunity to discourse him after: But this is clouding the business instead of reconciling it. Why did not he tell us fairly, that this *last sickness* (if he is resolv'd to have it so) was such a sickness, in which Mrs. Gauden represents him to have done the most considerable actions of his life; that after he was visited with this infirmity, he went to the King, acquainted him with the matter, appeal'd to Bishop Duppa (who was then living, though ill,) for the truth of it; that upon that the King promised him the Bishoprick of Winchester, and that afterwards being vacant, was disposed to Bishop Morley, and the King gave him Worcester, and he was translated from Exeter thither? This is Mrs. Gauden's account of the matter, and 'tis wonderfull indeed, that when Dr. Gauden's *last sickness* was so rapid and violent, that he persv'd his interest with all diligence and application, ply'd at Court in person, took several journeys, and was remov'd from one Bishoprick to another; that any body should be so unreasonable as to think he could discourse Dr. Walker after he had been seiz'd with such a mortal distemper. He had better by half have said, that in Dr. Gauden's last sickness, his affairs were so many and tumultuary, that what with his attendance at Court, his long journeys, his frequent re-

G moves,

moves, he was not at leisure to talk with Dr. Walker; and this would have been something, how ill soever it would have agreed with the character of a *last sickness*, but to insinuate as if he had been just expiring, and then told the King for the benefit of his family, and presently dyed, is to abuse Mrs. Gauden as well as his Reader. But he is so taken up with the spuriousness of Authors, that his notion slides into his practice, and he counterfeits what he takes in hand. Mrs. Gauden calls it an *infirmity*, and that it seems a pretty lasting one too; and our Author to serve his purpose, coins it into his *last sickness*, to impose upon his Readers, and give them one thing for another. Well, if this *last sickness* will not account for the Contradiction, our Author hath no more to say, and the Reader must reconcile it himself, or else be contented with it. It was unkindly done of Mrs. Gauden, to name I know not how many things her Husband did after this *last sickness*; whereas she might as well have let them alone, or at least postpon'd his acquainting the King, and laid it nearer his death, and then our Author could have reconcil'd it well enough; but since she hath laid it so awkwardly, as Dr. Walker might have discours'd him over and over, notwithstanding twenty such last sicknesses, 'tis a knotty business, and our Author will embark himself no farther in it; he will not so much as tell us that Dr. Walker *might easily forget it*, or that Mrs. Gauden *knew more of her Husband's mind and actions than other people*: For Dr. Walker, (I suppose never expecting to be contradicted by Mrs. Gauden,) hath expressly affirm'd that he discours'd Dr. Gauden about the Book, after he was Bishop of Worcester elect, which is after all those periods of time in Mrs. Gauden's Narrative, after the seizing of that infirmity, (which our Author calls his last sickness,) after Bishop Duppa died, after Bishop Morley was remov'd to Winchester, and Dr. Gauden elected to Worcester. His words are, *I once asking him, (for we seldom were in private but somewhat was discours'd of this Book, even to the last time I saw him after he was Lord Bishop of Worcester elect,) whether that*
King

Dr. Wal-
ker's Ac-
count, p. 5.

King Charles the second knew that he wrote it, he gave me this Answer, I cannot positively and certainly say he doth, because he was never pleased to take express notice of it to me. And not content with this, he more roundly affirms the same thing, in disputing against Dr. Hollingworth, Whereas 'tis said Dr. Gauden told King Charles the Second he made the Book; he will not by any means permit Dr. Hollingworth to say so, but roundly answers, whoever said so, (let Mrs. Gauden look to her self,) said what was not so; he never told him, (and never I suppose will go near to extend to his last sickness, and a little farther,) and as if that was not enough, he still adds, 'tis strange he should himself tell the King, and yet not know the King knew it, but by inference, because the Duke of York did. So that here we have not only Dr. Walker's Testimony, but the same confirm'd by repeated assertions from himself; but how to reconcile it to Mrs. Gauden's Narrative is a task too difficult for me, and I perceive for our Author too; wherein 'tis affirm'd not only that he told the King himself, but also a long story about it, of his reasons of so doing, and a particular discourse of the King's concerning it; and if these be not flat Contradictions, for my part I never expect to know what it is for Witnesses to contradict each other.

Ibid. p. 15.

Having thus dispatch'd his Answers, 'tis time to come to another part, (which he takes especial care shall never be wanting,) and that is, his unfairness in concealing the two following instances.

In D. Walker's Evidence, Dr. Gauden takes it for granted that the King knew it, because he is sure the Duke of York doth; and he knowing it, he does not question but the King also doth: But in Mrs. Gauden's, he acquainted the King first, and the Duke afterwards, as Mrs. Gauden expressly, that he afterwards acquainted the Duke of York, that he was the Author; and the Duke answer'd he had thought his Father wrote it: and to confirm this she says, he then told his Highness, that the King had promis'd him

the Bishoprick of Winchester; and therefore this telling the Duke must be after that promise, which Mrs. Gauden says was at the same time that he told the King.

In Dr. Walker's, the reason of Dr. Gauden's assurance that the Duke knew it was, for that he had spoken of it to him, and own'd it as a seasonable and acceptable service; but in Mrs. Gauden's, that he had acquainted the Duke himself.

Now here are two staring Contradictions, and which I had expressly charg'd upon this Testimony; but our Author, I suppose because he had no Chronology ready, hath even left them as a couple of stubborn things not fit to be meddled with: But this is not all his unfairness, for he hath totally suppress'd and left out this whole matter, in the account he gives us of this affair; the Narrative he hath printed is mutilate and imperfect, (upon what reason he best knows,) but he pretends to supply it out of the Abstract, and he himself tells us, it is a *faithfull Extract made out of it before severall learned and worthy persons*: and all that is above recited, is in that Extract, and not one word of it in what he hath repeated out of it; and yet he tells his Reader *he would give him the substance of it*; and there is not the least mention of the Duke of York, or any thing that related to him, only *that he assur'd him of his favour*. I shall give the Reader the whole Paragraph, *That he afterwards acquainted the Duke of York* *Truth*
brought to light, p. 39. *that he was the Author of the Book which went under his Father's name, and that the Duke answer'd, he had thought that his Father wrote it: that her Husband then told his Highness that the King had promised him the Bishoprick of Winchester, and that his Highness assur'd him of his favour.* And now comes our Author, and by virtue of giving the *substance*, hath only the last words, *that the Duke assur'd him of his favour*, and hath left out all the rest as superfluous circumstance: So that I find by *substance* our Author doth not mean *the sense contracted*, and in short, but the substance of the thing; and I must needs allow him, that if ever Dr. Gauden told the Duke, the substance was

the

the Duke's favour; as if ever he told the King, the substance was a Bishoprick, and all the rest was mere shadow, something perhaps in appearance, but in reality nothing at all. In the mean time, this is fine dealing, and our Author can neither be trusted with my Arguments, nor with his own Cause, and what he cannot Answer in both, he shuffles out of the way; he first suppresses my Objections, and then that no body may perceive it, suppresses the thing it self: This is practising upon a Cause, instead of defending it, and I shall leave the Reader to give a name to it, and to judge of such proceedings as he sees occasion.

And thus I have done with what our Author hath to offer on this head; but I do not yet think fit to leave it, till I have laid down an intire scheme of the Contradictions that are between *Dr. Walker's* and *Mrs. Gauden's* Testimony; and I doe it for these two Reasons, 1. That the Reader may have at once a full and compleat view of them before him: And 2. That our Author shall have no possible way to mistake or conceal them; but if he thinks fit to reply, he must either fairly reconcile them, or confess he cannot, and give up the Cause. And I shall set down those I have already observed, and add some others which I have since taken notice of from *Mrs. Gauden's Narrative*, which our Author hath printed, and I shall set them in Columns opposite to one another.

Dr. Walker.

1. *Dr. Gauden* did not certainly know, and no more than *Dr. Walker* himself, whether the King had ever seen the Book.

2. He never knew what was the issue of sending it.

Mrs. Gauden.

1. The Marquis of *Hartford* deliver'd it to the King, and told him who the Author was.

2. His Majesty having some of the Essays read to him by Bishop *Duppa*, did exceedingly approve of them; and ask'd whether they could
not

Dr. Walker.

Mrs. Gauden.

3. He ventur'd to print it, without knowing the issue.

4. When the thing was done, he judg'd it not prudent to make farther noise about it, by enquiry.

5. Bishop Duppa wrote two Chapters, on the *Ordinance against the Common Prayer Book*, and the *denying his Majesty the attendance of his Chaplains*, which Dr. Gauden own'd, and never pretended to have written those.

6. If the Title was *Suspiria Regalia*, it was one of the King's Corrections.

7. Some time before the whole was finish'd the Title was the *Pourtraiture*, &c. when Dr. Gauden first shew'd it me, the Title was as is printed.

8. The proof Sheets, and other papers, were taken at Mr. Simmons's Lodging, upon a particular pique, by a Lieu-

tenant not be put out in some other name, &c.

3. After he had been inform'd of the issue, he thought the Book might be effectual to move the hearts of the people, and my Lord Marquis bad him doe what he would.

4. When my Lord Marquis had fully inform'd him, and left him to his own liberty, then immediately he resolv'd to print it.

5. He resolv'd to print it, only he then added the Essay upon their denying his Majesty the attendance of his Chaplains, and the *Meditation of Death*, after the Votes of Non-addresses.

6. The Title which he then gave it was *Suspiria Regalia*.

7. Upon sending it to the Press, my Husband did then alter the Title of it, and call'd it *Icon Basilike*.

8. When it was about half printed, those in power found the Press where it was printing, and likewise a Letter of tenant

Dr. Walker.

tenant and six Troopers; but restor'd so as Mr. *Simmons* missed not one paper, all being return'd the next day, and no time to examine the papers.

9. Bishop *Juxton* might not have seen the King till he was brought to *St. James's*, Jan. 19. 1648. and had leave to assist him *in extremis*, and that was after the Book was printed.

Hitherto we have brought this Testimony down to the King's murder, and there is not one single step that concerns the Book without a Contradiction; and now we come to the Restauration.

Dr. Walker.

10. Dr. *Gauden* could not positively and certainly say that King *Charles II.* knew that he wrote it, and the reason of that was because,

11. The King was never pleas'd to take express notice of it to him.

12. Dr. *Gauden* takes it for granted he doth, because he is sure the Duke of *York* doth, and he knowing it, he

Mrs. *Gauden*.

my Husband's; whereupon they destroy'd all that they then found printed, but could not find out whence the Letter came, having no name to it.

9. My Husband attempted the printing of it again, but could by no means get it finish'd till some few days after his Majesty was destroy'd.

Mrs. *Gauden*.

10. He went to his Majesty and told him the whole matter, and for the truth of it appeal'd to Bishop *Duppa*.

11. The King entertain'd some discourse with my Husband about it, and said he often wondred how his Father should have time and privacy enough, &c. and then promised him the Bishoprick of *Winchester*.

12. He told the King himself; and moreover told the King first, and the Duke afterwards, and at the same questions

Dr. Walker.

Mrs. Gauden.

questions, not but the King
also doth.

13. He is sure the Duke
knew it, because he had spo-
ken of it to him, and own'd
it as a seasonable service.

time told his Highness that
the King promis'd him the
Bishoprick of *Winchester*.

13. He told the Duke
himself.

P. 114.

And now what a comfortable account have we got
here? here are no fewer than *thirteen* Contradictions,
and every one of them in *matter of fact*; and I do not
much question, but I might have observ'd more, if I could
have recover'd Mrs. Gauden's Narrative intire and com-
pleat. Our Author tells us he would *insert the Narrative*
at large, as exactly copied; but then neither tells us where
he had it, that it might be inspected, nor doth he give it
perfect, but wanting all the latter part; and whether that
which remains was not to be found, or not fit to be seen,
I shall not undertake to determine: But he that considers
how our Author hath suppress'd an intire paragraph out
of the Abstract of it, which made against him, may con-
ceive it not impossible but part of the Narrative it self
may be suppress'd for the same reason; and I shall freely
speak my thoughts, I doubt there were some dangerous
passages behind, not fit to be trusted abroad, least they
should have made too open a discovery; and I am sure
there is no more injustice in concealing the Narrative, than
using the same practice upon the Abstract. However, here
is enough in all conscience to make men out of Love with
Accounts and *Narratives*; and when two persons preten-
ding to tell the same story, are at mortal odds, and per-
petually contradict one another as fast as they can, that in-
stead of giving the same account, a man would think they
were at *cross purposes*: He talks of one thing, and she of ano-
ther; Dr. Walker's Dr. Gauden is quite another thing from
Mrs. Gauden's Husband, he knew nothing of King Charles
the

the First's knowing it, nor of the issue of sending it, nor that King *Charles* the Second knew it; but Mrs. *Gauden's* Husband knew all this perfectly, and a great deal more: The Book that Dr. *Walker's* Dr. *Gauden* wrote, had neither the same Title, nor met with the same accidents, nor came out at the same time with that of Mrs. *Gauden's* Husband, and yet Dr. *Walker* is as sure of *his man*, as he can be of any thing; and Mrs. *Gauden* is as sure as he, and hath moreover Letters to make it out. And is not this rare Evidence to convince the World, and to turn them from a settled and well grounded opinion? Our Author indeed pretends to reconcile the contradictions, but does not deny the consequence, that if they do contradict each other, their Evidence is of no value; and whether their Testimony be contradictory, and that irreconcilably too, I have set the matter plainly in the Reader's view, and shall leave him at full liberty to judge of it.

The next thing I am to take notice of, is such a gross omission, that I cannot tell what to call it, I never met with the like in any Author, and I believe no man else; I take it to be an original, and I think there is no other instance in the world of a man pretending to defend a Cause, and to answer the Objections made against it, and at the same time leave the main hinge of the Controversie perfectly untouch'd. And thus stands the Case between our Author and me; the Point I had insisted on was, *That whatever is said on that side to intitle Dr. Gauden to this Book, is finally resolv'd into the single Testimony of Dr. Gauden himself*; if you persue every thing that is said to the last resort, here it centers, and 'tis all but Dr. *Gauden's* own Testimony; let it be granted that King *Charles*, King *James*, Dr. *Walker* and Mrs. *Gauden* said what our Author would have them, still you come to this, and you have no more than that Dr. *Gauden* told them so: Now if that Testimony be lyable to very great prejudices, if it be utterly insufficient to determine the Case in behalf of Dr. *Gauden*, then apparently, whatever becomes of the rest, the main Cause is perfectly lost, as sailing in the

H

founda-

foundation, and upon which the whole is built. And that is a pure Answer indeed, and signifies much, when supposing every thing he says was granted him, (not one of which he yet hath, and I suppose will never be able to make good,) the Controversie stands where it did. Dr. *Gauden* is not the Author, as having no other Witnesses but himself to attest it, and that single Witness upon many accounts is very suspicious. I shall not trouble my self to reflect on this, but shall leave it to his own Party to doe me justice; and they may see what a fine Advocate they have got, who hath written a whole Book, and left the Controversie behind him: For, admitting that Dr. *Walker* and Mrs. *Gauden* were good Witnesses, and that there was no manner of contradiction in their Evidence, which is all that he desires, and much more than he can prove, why then I answer, this is nothing else but Dr. *Gauden*'s single Testimony passing through them, which in such a case and in such circumstances, is not to be rely'd on, and is utterly insufficient to defeat the King's Title, and to make good his own. And thus all his Book is answered, though he had made good every particular he hath undertaken; and I shall leave it with any man, how faintly he hath answer'd Exceptions, and defended his own Cause, when he hath industriously avoided such a head of objections as invalidates all he hath said, and this he calls answering; so that, it seems, with him to run away from the Question, is the best Answer to it. I am asham'd (though our Author is not to give such occasion) that I have been forc'd so often to repeat what he hath as often omitted; but I must yet beg the Reader's patience, that I may supply this shamefull defect also, and give him a short view of this particular, and then leave him to judge what a fair Answerer I am concern'd with. And thus it is:

Upon supposition that all that had been attest'd in behalf of Dr. *Gauden* was truly attest'd, it is all finally resolv'd into his own Testimony, and which is of no consideration, nor ought to have any weight in the Case before us, for these Reasons:

I. " Be-

I. "Because 'tis in his own Cause, and he is his own Witness; and that cannot be admitted in these two Cases." *Vind. p. 24. to 28.*

1. "When there is another claim, and pretender in possession, as is the case of this Book.

2. "If it be matter of interest or advantage, a man will never be admitted to witness for himself, and his own profit; and if those papers be true, Mrs. Gauden revealed a great secret, when she said, *that her Husband hoped to make a Fortune by it.* To this our Author answers *that ought not to be accounted strange; and he should rather doubt Dr. Gauden was not the Author of this Forgery, if he had not expected a Reward for it.* Perhaps the Reader may think that this contradicts what I had before asserted, that he hath not taken the least notice of this Head; but that assertion is most true, for he hath not mentioned it as if it had any relation to Dr. Gauden's Testimony, but hath ridiculously made it of another consideration, and which therefore is nothing at all to the purpose; for what, I pray, is the Question? whether if Dr. Gauden made the Book, he hop'd to make a Fortune by it, and expected a Reward for it? No such matter, and none but one of our Author's size, could ever think it was; but the Question is whether when Dr. Gauden's being the Author is a Question, his own Testimony be sufficient to carry it, especially when the end of such Testimony is to make a Fortune, and get a Reward? This is the Case which our Author flies from, as if it were infectious; and what I wonder does his impertinent harrangue belong to, *of peoples serving the King, no more than God, for nought, and Divines making the same steps for preferment with other men?* why this shews that our Author is very free and copious when 'tis to no purpose, but very sparing and reserv'd when there is just occasion: in the mean time the matter before us, is only what concerns a man's witnessing for himself and testifying for his own advantage, which is against the sense of mankind, and the practice of all nations, and founded upon a most certain

tain principle of a man's being too favourable and partial to himself. Now here we have a Question, Who was the Author of this Book? and to countenance one man's Title there are papers produc'd, representing him under a very disadvantageous character, as magnifying his own merits beyond all the bounds of modesty and decency, as immoderately pursuing preferment, and turning every stone to come at it; importuning the King, his Royal Brother, the Ministers of State, and trying all ways and means to encompass it; this is the representation the very papers give which are urged for his Title, and is this no prejudice to such a man's Testimony, in such a case, and for such ends? and our Author mends the matter much, when he tells us, *He should rather doubt Dr. Gauden was not the Author of this Forgery, if he had not expected a Reward for it*; so that he plainly supposes him guilty of Forgery in expectation of a Reward: an excellent Testimony indeed, which is founded upon the corruption of the Witness. But if he could forge any thing for a Reward, 'tis an easie Question whether that Forgery was making himself the Author, or making the Book? the first he might easily doe if he was disposed to it, but the latter I believe impossible, though he had never so much mind to it.

P. 103.

2. " Another thing which would take off the force of
 " Dr. Gauden's Testimony in this case, supposing he ever
 " attested it, is the immorality and infamy of the whole
 " practice. This our Author saith, *if it could by any means hold water, is an Argument worth a million*. Well, whether it will hold water or no, we shall see presently; but the Reader is first to be reminded, that though our Author speaks of the *immorality*, yet it is only according to his own fancy, and not in the least referring to Dr. Gauden's Testimony, and the purposes upon which I urg'd it; but I propos'd it in one sense, and he speaks to it in another; and accordingly he frames this consequence, not from any thing I had said, but from his own imagination, *Then* (saith he) *it would clearly follow, that because it was a most immoral thing to lye for God, and to forge Books, Epistles,*

pistles, or the like, under the names of Christ and his Apostles, there were therefore never any such pieces. And what is this consequence to the dispute between us? I perceive we have all the while been mistaking the Question, which it seems is not, Who is the true Author? but Whether there be any such Book or no? But this, I suppose, was for our Author's diversion, who loves wandring mightily; and it is a pleasant consequence, and fit for none but our Author, to argue from the immorality to the denial of the thing; whereas I had urged it to take off the force of Dr. Gauden's Testimony, and which it certainly does; and those who argue for his Title, in order to it, represent him guilty of a gross Forgery, and they have no other way to it, but to lay such an original stain upon his reputation, as makes his Testimony of no value in the world. For what I wonder, is such a Witness worth, who before he can say any thing to the matter, and in the first step of his Evidence, proclaims himself guilty of Forgery, in the very case to which his Evidence refers? This is a knot may be cut, but can never be untied; and neither Dr. Gauden himself, nor any body for him, can say one word to this, but what is tainted in the foundation, and undermines it self; they cannot justify his Title, but by destroying his Credit, and the same breath that pleads his Cause, blasts his Testimony and ruins it; and it is a pure Cause indeed, and admirably supported, when there is nothing else to maintain it, but supposing a Forgery in the principal and only Witness in the very Case. The Cause on that side stands upon a Forgery, the advocates own it, and can say nothing without it, and the Consequences I draw from it are as clear as the Sun, and can never be denied: "He that can
 "forge for the King, may forge for himself too; he that
 "can father his own Book upon the King, and deceive for
 "his honour, may with the same justice lay claim to a
 "Book that is none of his, and deceive for his own profit; and it is an admirable Testimony, when he first declares that he abused the world in giving them a Book
 "for the King's which was not his, and then abused the
 "King.

“ King in taking great pains to assume it to himself, he
 “ by publishing it, gave as publick Evidence as was pos-
 “ sible, that the King was the Author, and if he told King
 “ *Charles* the Second, *Dr. Walker*, *Mrs. Gauden*, or any
 “ other, that he himself was the Author, then he told
 “ them one thing, and the whole Kingdom another; which
 “ at last makes a fine Evidence of it, which in the very
 “ case contradicts it self. But this and a great deal more,
 and all that belongs to this head, our Author is absolutely
 resolv’d shall not belong to the Controversie, and more fit
 to be expung’d than answer’d: Well, if our Author’s ta-
 lent does not lye that way, let him take his liberty, and
 answer what he can, and let the rest alone, and if his Par-
 ty will be well contented with it, I shall say no more a-
 gainst it.

But that our Author may not have said nothing at all,
 I shall out of civility to him, consider the *immorality* of
 the practice in his sense, and according as he refers it. *The*
Immorality (says he) *of this Forgery is urged as an Argu-*
ment against it, and to oblige him, I will now so urge it;
 and my reason is, for that immoral and foul practices will
 be abetted by none but immoral and ill men; a man of
 probity and vertue will neither engage in, nor countenance
 such actions. Now *Dr. Walker* tells us that Bishop *Dup-*
pa not only approv’d it, and became a party to it, by en-
 couraging of it, but was a partner in the work, and com-
 posed two Chapters; and *Mrs. Gauden* affirms that Bishop
Duppa, Archbishop *Sheldon*, and Bishop *Morley* were privy
 to it, and became parties to it, by consenting to it, and
 approving it, (whether before or after the fact makes no
 difference in the guilt,) and they both make *Mr. Symmons*
 a party, as knowing the Forgery, and being instrumental in
 the publication. Now the Immorality of the Forgery I
 take to be a considerable argument against it, meaning that
 the very nature of those ill practices is a sufficient reason
 to convince any man, that those great, vertuous and good
 men were never engaged in them; the very character of
 the persons confutes the charge, and while they have en-
 deavour’d

deavour'd to bring great and venerable names to countenance a bad Cause, they have ruin'd their pretences instead of supporting them; neither Bishop *Duppa*, Bishop *Sheldon*, Bishop *Morley*, nor Mr. *Symmons*, and much less all of them together, could be guilty, and parties to such a scandalous contrivance, as to cheat the world, and betray a righteous Cause by frauds and counterfeits; and by joyning these men in the imposture, the whole is laid open, and there never was any such thing, because the practice is too infamous for such men to be concern'd with; and consequently the Forgery is all the other way, and affects only Dr. *Walker's* Account, and Mrs. *Gauden's* Narrative.

There are yet behind Two other very material things that relate to Dr. *Gauden*, one our Author mentions, and the other he hath forgot.

The First is the Letter of Mr. *Le Pla*, Minister of *Finchingfield*, giving account that *William Allen*, formerly a Servant to Dr. *Gauden*, affirm'd to him, "That Dr. *Vind. p. 32.*
Gauden told him he had borrowed the Book, and was "obliged to return it by such a time, that (besides what "other time he might imploy in it) he sate up one whole "night to transcribe it, that he sate up in the Chamber "with him, to wait upon him, to make his Fires, and "snuff his Candles; that Mr. *Le Pla* thinks, (but is not "positive) it was from Mr. *Symmons* of *Rayne* that Dr. "*Gauden* borrowed the Book. To this our Author gives two Answers, First, That Mr. *Symmons* did not at that P. 148.
 time live at *Rayne*, but was sequester'd long before. And what then? and therefore Dr. *Gauden* could not borrow the Book from Mr. *Symmons*. This is an excellent consequence, especially when Dr. *Walker* and Mrs. *Gauden* intimate that there was great friendship and familiarity between them, and they both make Mr. *Symmons* such a confident of Dr. *Gauden's* as to be solely intrusted by him for the printing it; and as I take it, the Question is not where Mr. *Symmons* lived? or whether he was sequester'd or no? but whether Dr. *Gauden* borrowed the King's Manuscript of him? The Second Answer is, *Now is it credible that*
 Dr. *Gau-*

Dr. Gauden, whether he meant a fraud or not, should give an account of his studies, much less discover the Secret of this Book, for no reason in the world, to never so trusty a Servant, especially to one that was to look after his Fire and snuff his Candles. Now this is a pleasant Answer upon many accounts; for,

1. As to the character of the Servant, let him be in what capacity our Author please in the Doctor's family, it is plain enough he was intrusted by him in his most secret and important affairs, as *having been sent upon many messages in the night, between the Doctor and his family, in those times of difficulty, and had moreover incurr'd several dangers on his account, and ventur'd his life more than once to defend him; which plainly shew'd (as the Letter sets forth) the great confidence the Doctor had in him, and the reason he had for it; and the taking him to sit up with him on that secret occasion, let the secret be what it would, is a sufficient proof of it, if there were no other.* And therefore,

2. This Answer destroys it self. *It is not credible, (saith he) that Dr. Gauden should discover the Secret of this Book to never so trusty a Servant; and yet it seems, as incredible as it was, it was actually done; for the very sitting up with him, and seeing him transcribe it, discover'd the Secret, whatever that Secret was, let it be the King's, or Dr. Gauden's, or whose you will, the Book was discover'd, and 'twas impossible it should be otherwise; and 'tis a pleasant Answer to say it was not credible he should discover it, when at the same time his Servant saw the Book, and saw him transcribing it; but it seems, with our Author, matters of fact are the most incredible things in the world.*

3. *William Allen expressly affirms, that Dr. Gauden told him that he had borrowed the Book, and was obliged to return it by such a time; and now comes our Author, and for Answer tells us, it is not credible that he should give an account of his studies, and discover the Secret. Why, if the Doctor had given no account to him, and discover'd nothing,*

nothing, he must have guess'd as well as he could; but when he had plainly told him he had borrowed it, and was to return it, it is pleasant to talk of giving no account, and the incredibleness of discovering what he did in plain terms discover to him. But there is nothing so weak and trifling, but will serve our Author for an Answer, although one would think that a Testimony of this nature, which strikes at the root of the Cause, and at once destroys all their pretences, might have deserv'd a better Answer, if he could have told how to have given it. Here Dr. Gauden himself tells his Servant how he came by the Book, and that is, *he borrowed it*; and if he borrowed it, then it was none of his own; and here it rests till our Author can find an Answer for it. And to this I add,

Secondly, Dr. Gauden's own farther Testimony in the case. This our Author hath forgot, as not worth his while, and he has the best faculty in the world of slipping out of the way what he cannot answer, and what bears hardest upon his Cause; and I must yet trespass upon the Reader, and shew him what our Author is resolv'd, if he can help it, he shall never take notice of, and it is the Testimony of Mr. Long, then and now Prebendary of the Church of Exeter, in these words, *I have heard him* (Bishop Gauden *Vind.* p. 42. when Bishop of Exeter,) *often affirm, that he was fully convinc'd that the εἶκον βασιλικὴ was intirely that King's work;* and to strengthen this Testimony Mr. Long tells very considerable circumstances, and which induc'd the occasion of the Bishop's and his discoursing concerning the Book, and the Author of it, (*viz.*) *that on the 30 of January in the Bishop's first year, the Bishop preached in the Cathedral in the forenoon, on Jonah 1. 14. and Mr. Long, by the Bishop's order in the afternoon, on Isa. 49. 23. and aggravating the King's murther, among other arguments he urg'd his piety and clemency, reading several paragraphs out of his Book to that purpose, and that after the duties of the Fast were over, the Bishop invited him to supper, and standing by the fire side, he gave him thanks for his Sermon, and then declar'd to him what he hath attested above.* This Testimony

timony is full, both as to substance and circumstance, and the character of the person attesting sufficiently secures it from all objection, and therefore I shall not need to say any thing to it; only desire our Author to remember, that when Dr. Gauden was fully convinc'd that it was entirely the King's work, he could not himself pretend to have any hand in the composing it.

I now proceed to the last Head, the Testimonies that prove King Charles the First to be the Author, and to consider the Exceptions our Author makes against them, and the Reader will find him the same man still, his Answers and Exceptions are exactly parallel, and he disproves the Witnesses that I produce, at the same rate that he justifies his own.

The First is that of Major Huntington, given by Sir William Dugdale, (in his *Short View of the Troubles in England*,) "For the Manuscript it self, written with his own hand, being taken at *Navesby* fight, was restor'd to him after he was brought to *Hampton Court*, by the hand of Major Huntington, through the favour of General Fairfax, of whom he obtain'd it. This is a Testimony full and direct to the matter, and clear and particular in the manner; a person attesting he brought the Book, the means whereby he obtain'd it, the person to whom he deliver'd it, and the place where; and it is impossible to take off the force of this, but by impeaching the credit of the Witness, or of the Relator, or by shewing some inconsistency or contradiction in the matter attested, either with it self, or with other Witnesses in the same Cause: This is the only way, and there is no other, to take off the validity of any Evidence; where the matter is credible in it self; and this is the method I have taken with his Witnesses, but this is not the least in his thoughts, he is not for taking a fit and just course, but satisfies himself with talking a little idly about it, and then leaves it. Thus for instance in the first place he tells us, *By the way, they should have said, for the grace of the story*, Part
of

of the Manuscript; *for a good deal of the Book was written afterwards, be the Author who you please.* And by the way too, this is a very foolish objection: for why, I wonder, may not Part of the Manuscript be called *The Manuscript*, especially when it refers to a time when there was no more written? and I hope it was the same Manuscript afterwards, although there might be both alterations and additions in it. But our Author, in the want of reasons, is for turning Critick, and instead of the Truth is for excepting to the Grace of an Evidence. *The Manuscript!* 'tis a monstrous impropriety, whereas it ought to have been Part of the Manuscript; and what is Major *Huntington's* Evidence worth when Sir *William* tells the story with so ill a grace? Next our Author tells a fine story, *They should have told us how General Fairfax durst send one part of his Papers to the King, when he sent the rest to the Parliament; and since they would make us believe he was so kind to the King, why did not he restore all the Papers, when those the Parliament order'd to be published were infinitely of greater consequence, and made him a world of enemies, whereas these would probably mollifie some of his opposers? and though General Fairfax was afterwards against putting the King to death, yet he was not at that time disposed to grant him any favours, and acted with as hearty zeal against him as any in the Nation; which appears by all the Histories of those times, as well as by his own, and the Memoirs of the Lord Hollis.* To this I answer,

I. As to History, our Author is perfectly out, and knows nothing at all of the matter, or else prevaricates: For after the King was taken from *Holdenby* and removed to the Army, (which was a good while before this Book was deliver'd to him at *Hampton Court*,) not only General *Fairfax*, but *Cromwell* too, were disposed to grant him many favours, (if they must be so called,) and actually did so, as permitting the attendance of his Chaplains and other Servants, and granting him many other liberties and conveniencies which the Parliament denied him: and though *Cromwell* did this deceitfully, yet General *Fairfax* was
 I 2 hearty

hearty and sincere; and any man who knows the state of
 affairs at that time, the correspondence between the King
 and him, together with the King's Letters to him, will be
 so far from thinking that there should be any repugnancy
 for him to favour the King with the return of this Book,
 that he would have done for him many more, and more
 considerable services, if he had been able. And yet our
 Author hath the confidence to appeal to all the Histories of
 those times; and which is yet more bold, he appeals to
 my Lord Fairfax's own *Memoirs*, which express the con-
 trary almost in every line: That after 1646. he grew wea-
 ry of the Army, and desired rather to be a Sufferer than
 Commander, and would have laid down his Commission;
 and says expressly, *if you find me carried on with this*
stream, it was by the violence of it, rather than my own
consent; that he used all endeavours to prevent the purging
 the House, and did secure it a year from violence; that in
 particular of the King's remove from Holmby, he says, *the*
sad consequences whereof fill my heart with grief in the re-
membrance of them, as they did then with care how to pre-
vent them; that he sent two Regiments of Horse to re-
 move that force from the King, and to acquaint him how
 much the General was troubled at those great insolencies
 that had been committed so near his person; and would
 have had a Council of War to proceed against Joyce for
 that high offence, but his endeavours were ineffectual. So
 that we see plainly enough, that before the King was Pri-
 soner at Holmby, General Fairfax was not so zealous a-
 gainst him as our Author would make us believe; but
 from that time, and before, his zeal is express'd against
 the hypocrisie and baseness of the Army; and plainly says,
 that from the time of the rendezvouz at Triploew Heath,
 he never gave free consent to any thing they did; and
 though they set his name to Papers and Declarations, yet
 this was a force and ravishment of a good name, rather
 than a voluntary consent; and abundance more to this pur-
 pose. And by this time I suppose the Reader will be as-
 tonish'd at our Author's confidence, to appeal to these *Me-*
moirs

Lord Fair-
 fax's Mem.

p. 105.

p. 109.

p. 111.

p. 112, 113,

p. 116.

p. 125.

moirs to confirm his assertion, when they express the clean contrary in every page. And let any man judge what a fine Adversary I have to deal with, who will not represent truly, neither my Exceptions nor his own Cause, nor Quotations out of Authors, nor any thing, but corrupts every thing that comes under his hands; he first makes my Lord *Fairfax* wonderfully zealous against the King's person, and incapable of doing him any favour, and then to make that good, makes *Memoirs* for him too, and directly contrary to those he made himself. And,

2. As to the rest, *How durst he send one part to the King, when he sent the rest to the Parliament? and why did not he restore all the Papers, if he was so kind?* This is all wildness, and as it deserves none, so any Answer will serve: Perhaps he kept it out of curiosity, perhaps out of design, and perhaps too by mere accident; however, I shall not trouble my self to give reasons for that which needs none: what my Lord *Fairfax* durst do, or durst not do; why he sent the Letters and kept the Book, is nothing at all to the case, which depends not upon answering abstruse Questions, or giving reasons for dark and mysterious passages; but 'tis matter of fact, and depends purely upon Testimony; and when Major *Huntington* testifies that *he applied to General Fairfax, and by his means obtain'd it*, 'tis a pleasant business indeed to ask how the General durst do it; for if he did it, he certainly durst do it; and that he did it, there is plain and sufficient Evidence, and there is the end of the Question, and it can go no farther. And all that is in this Case is resolv'd into these Two Questions, and there neither is nor can be any other, Whether Major *Huntington* was a true man, and testified the Truth? and Whether that Testimony was truly reported? But our Author is not for coming home to the case, but diverting it, by asking a company of idle Questions, how he durst do it? and Why did not he restore the other Papers? and it is a pleasant reason indeed, he did not restore the Book, because he did not restore something else: I wonder he did not make it a reason, that
he

he did not restore the Jewels taken in the Cabbinet, or that he did not restore the Baggage and Ammunition taken at *Naseby*. However, at length he tells us, *that Dr. Walker assures, that Major Huntington told him, that all that he had said was, that he surely believed those were the papers he saw him so usually take out of his Cabbinet, but that he never read one line or word of them.* And this is a piece of our Author's usual confidence, to repeat over the same thing, and never take notice of the Answer to it: I had confronted this with three several Testimonies from *Major Huntington*, and all of them directly contradictory to this story of *Dr. Walker's*; and if he would have said any thing to this point, he ought to have supported *Dr. Walker's* credit, (which he hath all along neglected,) and to have shewn us that we ought to rely upon his account, rather than upon *Sir William Dugdale's* and the rest. But of all the Disputers I ever met with, I never saw the fellow of our Author, who at no hand and in no case, will be brought to speak to the true point. And here I must once again be forc'd to tire the Reader's patience, and give him the true state of the Case, which is apparently thus.

To shew that *Dr. Walker's* account was all mere story, his own invention, and not one word of truth in it, I had produc'd the very Testimony *Major Huntington* gave to *Sir William Dugdale*, (which I have now in my hands,) and 'tis part of a written relation which he gave to *Sir William*, of several considerable matters relating to *King Charles the First*, in which himself was personally concern'd; he declares his own knowledge, and facts in which himself was engaged, and all the parts of the relation corroborate each other, and to deny one branch is to deny the whole relation; and among other things, what concerns the Book is in these words:

Vind. p. 35. And as to the Eicon Basilike, he saith, that after the King was brought to Hampton Court, his Majesty there acquainting him with the loss of that Book at *Navesby* fight, and desiring him to use his interest to regain it, he did himself apply to *General Fairfax*, and by his means obtained it,

it, it being bound up in a white Vellum Cover, and (as he well remembers) all the Chapters were written by the hand of Sir Edward Walker, but much corrected with interlineations by the King's own hand, the Prayers being all written with the King's own hand, which he says he very well knew so to be. This is the very Testimony which Major *Huntington* gave to Sir *William Dugdale*, and which contradicts every word of *Dr. Walker's* relation, and the consequence is, that *Dr. Walker* had either a good invention or a bad memory. And what doth our Author say to this? Not one single word, nor take the least notice of it; and at the same time hath the confidence to shuffle *Dr. Walker's* Tale among Major *Huntington's* Testimonies, and insists upon it without offering the least syllable to clear it of the difficulties, or giving one reason why it ought to be credited; and not only so, but draws his inference from it, as if that was most true, and all the other most false: For thus he fums up the Evidence, *One saw the King write he knew P. 146. not what, but believ'd it might be this Book*, meaning *Dr. Walker's* idle story! This is such a scandalous proceeding, so unbecoming the ingenuity of humane nature, that 'tis a shame to meet with it in the streets, and equally reflects upon the civility of a man's breeding, as the weakness of his Cause; and such confident assertions and repetitions are an offence against good manners, as well as against good reason.

In the mean time, since I have been forced to repeat this Testimony, I will beg the Reader's leave to make this one Remark upon it; that it is as full and compleat an Evidence as could possibly be given in such a Case, and carries its own light and strength with it; and let any man but observe the steps and particulars, and he will soon be satisfied: As in the first place, *The King acquainting him with the loss of the Book, and desiring him to use his interest to regain it; and upon that information and request of the King, he apply'd to General Fairfax, and by his means obtain'd it:* And then there is the character of the Book it self, *that it was bound up in a white Vellum Cover,*

ver, that *all the Chapters were written by the hand of Sir Edward Walker, but much corrected with interlineations with the King's own hand; that the Prayers were all written with the King's own hand, and which he very well knew so to be.* Now here is a Testimony so full and clear in it self, so particular and express in all circumstances, so coherent one part with another, and so satisfactory in all points, that 'tis next to impossible that any matter of fact should be better attested: Here is the reason and ground of his proceeding, the means and methods whereby he obtain'd it, the description of the Book as to its outward form and binding, a particular specification of the different hands in which it was written, part by *Sir Edward Walker*, and the interlineations and Prayers with the King's own hand, and clos'd up with an affirmance of his own knowledge of the King's hand, and which he very well knew so to be. And I shall lay that weight upon it which it justly deserves, and challenge our Author to say one reasonable word against it, or to offer the least syllable to invalidate the force of it; and if he had said ten times more than he hath, or I presume will ever be able to say, in defence of his Cause, the weight of this single Testimony would bear it all down before it, and carry the Cause against him.

The next thing is, Two other Testimonies taken from Major *Huntington*, one by *Mr. Duke*, the other by *Mr. Becke*. The substance of *Mr. Duke's* is, that "Major *Huntington* told him more than once, that whilst he guarded King *Charles* the First at *Holmby house*, (as *Mr. Duke* remembers,) he saw several Chapters or Leaves of that great King's Meditations lying on the Table several mornings, with a pen and ink, with which the King scratch'd out, or blotted, some lines or words of some of them,——and that the Major told him he did suppose them originally from that learned Prince: *Mr. Becke's* is the same with that of *Sir William Dugdale*, only with this addition, "that when he deliver'd them to the King, his Majesty appear'd very joyfull, and said he esteem'd
" them

“ them more than all the Jewels he had lost in his Cabinet. Now upon the whole our Author thus answers, *This* P. 137.

Major Huntington was a strange man to vary so often in his story, and to tell so much more or less to every body that enquired of him; and that 'tis no wonder that these Gentlemen should so widely differ from one another, both as to time, and place, and matter of fact. But where is this difference that he talks on, in all these respects? he ought to have been so civil to his Reader, to have shewed him the particulars; but he boldly fastens a charge, and then leaves the Reader to make it good himself, and to look for that which can never be found. For first, as to *time* there is not the least tittle of difference, nor the least pretence, or colour for it; but that was put in to compleat the number, but for the truth of it our Author is not concern'd about it; 'tis enough for him to assert it, whether he could prove it or no. And secondly, as to *place* there is no difference neither, for though Mr. Duke speaks of *Holmby*, yet he does it with this qualification, *as he remembers*, but is not positive but it might be some other place; and if our Author could not see this, I had told him so before in plain terms, though he will not take notice of it. *Vind. p. 35.* And thirdly, as to *matter of fact* there is no difference, if by difference our Author means *disagreement*; for all these Testimonies agree well enough, and there is not the least clashing or interfering betwixt them; but if he means, as he says before, that they differ as to *more or less*, 'tis true enough, but then 'tis no objection; for there might be different occasions and reasons to speak of this matter, in discourses with different men, and Major *Huntington* might suit his information to the nature and matter of the respective discourses: however there is no manner of difference or addition to the matter, only to some circumstances relating to it. Major *Huntington* tells Sir *William Dugdale* he recover'd the Book, and delivered it to the King; and moreover tells Mr. *Duke*, that he saw the King blotting out some lines or words; and to Mr. *Beck*, that the King rejoiced exceedingly, when he received them.

This is a pure Objection indeed against an Evidence; I wonder he did not make it one, that Major *Huntington* did not tell Mr. *Beck* that *it was bound in a Vellam Cover*.
 Vind. p. 34. In the mean time this hath been answered already, " That
 " the Evidence is very consistent, and by no means contra-
 " dictory; Major *Huntington* might see the papers lye on
 " the table, &c. and yet before that, deliver the Book to
 " the King; this is not contradictory, but a supplement,
 " and a farther account of the Major's knowledge of the
 " matter. But our Author hath the best faculty in the
 world, at boldly repeating Objections, and never consider-
 ing the Answers to them; and I am to remark to the
 Reader that this is an Objection I had made to his hands,
 and it was not very fair, to take the Objection out of my
 Book, and at the same time leave behind him the Answer
 I had given to it.

In the next place he falls foul upon Sir *William Dugdale*, that *he has printed under Major Huntington's name, quite another story from the written memorial out of which he had it*: and to make this good, he says, *he positively says that the Manuscript was written with the King's own hand; but in his warrant for this, it is only said, that all the Chapters were written by the hand of Sir Edward Walker, but much corrected with interlineations of the King's hand, and that the Prayers were all so.* This (saith our Author) is quite another story; and one would think, to support this bold assertion, he should have produc'd something very considerable; for, as I take it, to make quite another story, is to make it differ *totò celo*, in all or most of the substantial parts or branches of it, or at least in some of them. But in our Author's quite another story, there is not the least difference in any thing that relates to the substance of the story; but 'tis forsooth the mighty difference of saying the *Manuscript written with the King's own hand*; when only part of it (and perhaps the greater part) was so written; as if Sir *William* had said *all the Manuscript*, or as if so much as the King had wrote with his own hand, was not sufficient to sustain that denomination. But this is
 just

just such another foolery, as *The Manuscript* for Part of the Manuscript; and to reply to it, is as ridiculous as to make it. In the mean time, there is nothing more contemptible than to make a great noise and puther about nothing, and plainly shews what shifts he is put to, when he lays the greatest weight on straws and trifles: His business here is to invalidate the force of Major *Huntington's* Testimony, or to impeach the credit of *Sir William's* report; and in order to that, he lays a monstrous and heavy charge on an impropriety of expression, and yet there is not so much as that. And we have more of the same in what follows.

Now (says he) to shew farther how cautiously people should rely on *Sir William Dugdale*, and *Historians* like him, we shall produce another remarkable instance: I suppose as remarkable as the former, which is remarkable indeed for our Author's folly, but for nothing else. In the Book before quoted he expressly writes, that *Mr. Herbert* did often see the Book, while he waited on the King in the *Isle of Wight*; whereas all that *Sir Thomas* hath said (with reference to that Book) is, "That at this time it was, as "is presum'd, that he compos'd his Book call'd *Suspiria* "Regalia, publish'd soon after his death, and intituled *The* "King's Pourtraiture, &c. which Manuscript *Mr. Herbert* "found among those Books his Majesty was pleased to "give him, in regard *Mr. Herbert*, though he did not see "the King write that Book, his Majesty being allways "private when he writ, and those his Servants never coming into the Bed-chamber, when the King was private, till "he call'd, yet comparing it with his hand writing in "other things, he found it so very like as induces his belief it was his own, having seen much of the King's "writings before. To this our Author puts off his Answer, and at present says, *Here Sir Thomas only presumes the King might write the Book in the Isle of wight; and directly says he never saw the King write it, nor the Book it self, till after his death; but Sir William affirms from these very papers, that he often saw it in the Isle of Wight, when*

be waited on the King in his Bed-chamber. Now here our Author finds fault with an Historian, and with such a one too, who for his faithfulness, skill, and industry, hath been, and allways will be, deservedly admired; few ages or nations have produced a man comparable to him, in all the good qualities of an Historian; and the Kingdom reaps the benefit of his compleat judgment and indefatigable pains, in mighty and prodigious instances; and no man who hath heard of the name of *Sir William Dugdale*, need to be told how to rely on him; and it will equally move a man's indignation and contempt to see a little snarling Author treating him with reproach, and telling his Readers *how cautiously they should rely upon him, and Historians like him.* In the mean time, as to his Exceptions, I answer:

1. He pretends to censure *Sir William* for misrepresenting *Sir Thomas Herbert*, and at the same time does it notoriously himself; he says here, that *Sir Thomas directly says he never saw the Book till after the King's death*, whereas he says no such thing, neither directly nor by consequence; he says indeed he found the Manuscript among the Books which the King gave him; but that is so far from saying *directly* that he never saw it before, that it does not in the least imply any such thing: and he is fit indeed to tell us how cautiously we should rely upon Historians, who so grossly falsifies a quotation he had made but just before, and falsifies it too in that very thing in which the Answer consists. *Sir William* says, *it was frequently seen by Sir Thomas in the Isle of Wight*; and our Author, because he cannot find an Answer for this, makes one of his own head, and makes *Sir Thomas Herbert* say, and say directly too, that *he never saw it.* This is a direct Answer indeed, but 'tis a direct forgery too; and if Testimonies are a little of the straightest, 'tis but supplying them with a few words, and then our Author can deal well enough with them.

2. *Sir Thomas* says nothing of *seeing the Book*, and *Sir William* affirms from those very papers, that he often saw it.

it in the Isle of Wight. But how does our Author know that? These papers indeed were written at the request of Sir *William Dugdale*, but were there no other? Yes apparently, and our Author might have inform'd himself from the recital I had made out of this Book of Sir *Thomas Herbert's*, which begins thus, "By yours of the 22. of *Vind. p. 36*
August last, I find you have received my former Letters of the 1st. and 13th of *May*, 1678. and seeing it is your farther desire, I should recollect what I can well remember upon that sad subject more at large: So that Sir *William* had before receiv'd Two Letters on the same subject, and the intent of this, was to be a supplement to them, and to give a larger and more full recital of what might be omitted before; and in all probability, what Sir *William* said of Sir *Thomas's* seeing the Book in the Isle of Wight, was out of those former Letters, and the thing before us plainly declares it; for Sir *William's* purpose there, was to vindicate the King's Title: to that Book; and he would never have neglected such a pertinent proof, as Sir *Thomas* having the Manuscript it self, written with the King's own hand, and which he found to be so, by comparing it with other of the King's writings. This is more full and home than only seeing it, and Sir *William* could not have omitted it, if he had those papers before him when he wrote those passages; and 'tis probable that this supplemental and larger relation, which must take up so much time in the drawing up, containing 83 pages in *folio*, might come too late, for Sir *William's* *Short View of the Troubles* must have been in the Press then, or before he sent that Letter, for it contains near 250 Sheets; and was published the beginning of 1681, perhaps the latter end of 1680. for 'tis usual with Bookfellers to run the date three or four Months before the publication, and Sir *William's* Letter to Sir *Thomas* requesting that Relation, bears date *August* the 22. 1679.

However, upon the whole, it is to be observ'd, that when Sir *William Dugdale* published the Testimonies of these Gentlemen, they were both alive, as Sir *William* says,

I shall

I shall make it evident from the Testimony of very credible persons yet living : Major Huntington and Sir Thomas Herbert were both living at that time and after, when Sir William published their names to the world, as Witnesses to the truth of what he asserted; this shews the fairness of the proceeding, and the assurance Sir William had in what he reported, when he appeal'd to such vouchers as were in being, and might every day be spoke with; and moreover confirms the truth of his relation beyond all possible exception and contradiction. Let any man think, if he can, that Sir William would have appeal'd to living Witnesses for the proof of a forgery, or that either of those Gentlemen would have suffered their names to stand upon record, and in the face of the world, before the present age and posterity, to father a fictitious Testimony which they never gave, and not have taken care by some publick act to have disown'd it. Sir William plainly, openly, and before the world asserts, that Major Huntington recover'd the Book by the favour of General Fairfax, and that Sir Thomas Herbert saw it often in the *Isle of Wight*; they were both living then and after, and seeing neither they themselves, nor any body else, question'd it in their life time, 'tis impossible it should be done when they are dead; and Sir William's report stands the most firm and unexceptionable, and 'tis the utmost obstinacy and refractariness to dispute a Testimony in such circumstances.

I now proceed to Mr. Lever's Testimony, " That of his own certain knowledge he can depose the Book was truly the King's, having observ'd his Majesty oftentimes writing his Royal Resentments of the bold and insolent behaviour of the Souldiers, when they had him in their custody: That being nominated by his Majesty to be one of his Servants during the Treaty in the *Isle of Wight*, he had the happiness to read the same oftentimes in Manuscript under his Majesty's own hand, being pleas'd to leave it in the window of his Bed-chamber: And that when the King was remov'd to *Hurst Castle*, he had the charge of this Book, and a Cabinet of other papers, " which

" which at the said Castle he delivered again to his Majesty. This is our Author's representation of this Testimony, and the Reader may be sure it is done as may best serve his turn, but not very fairly, as we shall see immediately: for thus he begins, *Where, by the way, he does* P. 142. *not inform us, if the Book was distinctly given him from the Cabinet, or that he only concluded it was in it.* Now although this is a ridiculous Objection, and it signifies nothing whether it was in or out of the Cabinet, so long as Mr. Levet affirms, that he had the charge of the Book, as well as the Cabinet; yet it may serve to shew us our Author's unfairness, who hath pretermitted a material part of this Evidence, and which makes his Exception yet more ridiculous. Mr. Levet says, " That during the King's making himself ready, he concern'd himself only how to secure this Book of his, and a small Cabinet wherein he secur'd his Letters to his Queen. And then adds, " The King gave him in charge This said Book and small Cabinet: which makes them distinct enough, if that signified any thing. But the force of this Testimony does not lye in the distinction of the Book from the Cabinet, which is an Objection fit for none but our Author; but the Emphasis lies upon *This Book*, i. e. That very Book which Mr. Levet had oftentimes seen the King write in, and which he himself had read in Manuscript; *This Book* the King was concern'd to secure, and *This Book* he had in charge; and 'tis very pleasant indeed to ask whether he concluded it was in the Cabinet or not; for let him conclude it, or not conclude it, the Testimony is directly against him, which he neither will nor can answer, but shamefully trifles with it; and yet hath the confidence to sum up this Evidence in this manner, *Another observ'd* P. 145. *him writing his resentments against the rude behaviour of the Souldiers, and so was ready to depose of his certain knowledge that Icon Basilike was his own; whereas Mr. Levet offer'd to depose directly to the Book, and speaks of the Book directly and plainly throughout his Testimony: The Book he could depose of his own knowledge was the*
 King's

King's own, the same he read in Manuscript, the same the King was concern'd to secure, and the same the King gave him in charge when he was carried to *Hurst Castle*; and is all this no more than observing the King writing his resentments against the insolence of Souldiers? But when an Author lays aside all shame and modesty, he is qualified to say any thing in the world.

At length he comes to make his Exceptions against Sir *Thomas Herbert's* and *Mr. Levet's* Testimony, and his method is by confronting them against each other: *Here* (says he) *are several very observable circumstances, as first that although Mr. Herbert (who was of the King's Bed-chamber, never saw him write a syllable of this Book, his Majesty, he says, being allways in private when he wrote, and his Servants never coming into his Bed-chamber till he call'd; yet Mr. Levet, a Page of the Back-stairs, often saw him write, knew what he wrote, and could read the Book when he pleas'd. But this our Author doth not repeat fairly; he says his Majesty being allways in private when he wrote, and his Servants never coming in till call'd, as if it extended to all the King's Servants; whereas Sir Thomas speaks it with limitation those his Servants i. e. himself and Mr. Harington, (for he only speaks of them there, and only refers to them,) which plainly implies that some other of the King's Servants might be with him when he wrote in private, though they were not, otherwise there can be no sense made of that limitation Those his Servants; and this is a reason why Sir Thomas did not see the King write it, but is no reason but some other besides him might; and Sir Thomas's Testimony rather corroborates, than confronts that of Mr. Levet; he supposes the King wrote it in his Bed-chamber, though he did not see him, and Mr. Levet affirms he saw the King write it at the same time and place. And that Mr. Levet should see the King write it, and not Mr. Herbert, there is one apparent reason, and there may be many more: Mr. Levet was an old Servant, had allways stuck by the King, and waited on him, during all his sufferings, but the King never saw*
Mr. Herbert

Mr. *Herbert* 'till he attended the Parliament Commissioners to *Newcastle*, and never took him into his service, 'till all his own Servants were violently torn from him at *Holmby*; and it was rather necessity than choice, that caus'd him to pitch upon two of the followers of the Commissioners (Mr. *Herbert* and Mr. *Harrington*) to attend him in his Bed-chamber; and 'tis no wonder that the King should admit an old try'd Servant, and one that had constantly adher'd to him, to more privacy; and though the King was satisfied with Mr. *Herbert's* faithfulness, yet 'tis plain in the very instance before us, that he did not at that time use him in the same degree of trust with Mr. *Levet*: For this Book, and his Cabinet of Letters to the Queen, the things he was then most concern'd to secure, were committed to the charge of Mr. *Levet* and not Mr. *Herbert*.

His next Observation is, *That 'tis not very likely that the King, who is said to value this more than all his Jewels, should so carelessly leave it in his Bed-chamber, when he was abroad.* And why not, I pray, when it was under the care of Mr. *Levet*, who was no stranger to it, and who says expressly (which our Author hath left out) that *he was always obliged to attend there his Majesty's coming.* Well, but then Mr. *Herbert*, *say the very Souldiers, might see it as well as Mr. Levet.* Our Author it seems makes no difference between the King's Bed-chamber and a Guard-chamber, as if it was free for all comers and goers. But by his favour, no person, no not the Governour himself, could come into it, but by leave of the Page of the Back-stairs; and Mr. *Herbert* tells a memorable story, in this large relation, "That he and Mr. *Harrington* were in the Green, waiting on the King, who finding the weather somewhat cold, the King bad Mr. *Herbert* go for his Cloak, and entering the Bed-chamber, found the Governour (Collonel *Hammond*) ready to come forth, with one other Officer in company, and Mr. *Reading*, who then waited as Page of the Back-stairs, and by insinuation had let him in; and he adds, "That he gave the Page of the Back-stairs a sharp rebuke, and the Governour being made acquainted with
L " it,

"it, (by Mr. Reading,) threatened to dismiss Mr. Herbert. So that there was no such free access, as our Author imagines, to the Bed-chamber; especially during the King's absence; and the Governour himself, and much less any body else, could not come in; but by the treachery of the Page of the Backstairs. And this shews that the Bed-chamber was a place secure enough, and there was no such carelessness, in leaving it where no body could see it but Mr. Levet himself, and it plainly confirms Mr. Lover's Testimony.

And lastly, (says he,) *that the King should have so much leisure to mind this Book, during a Treaty with his Subjects, or would lose any time in writing of it, when the business in agitation concerned no less than his re-establishment or abdication, is not credible.* Well, as incredible as our Author thinks this is, he confutes it himself the very next page; for there he tells us, *Though the King in all reason might, and I really believe did, correct or interline a part, and perhaps transcribe the whole Book.* Now 'tis to be remembred, that our Author will have the Book sent to the King at this Treaty, and deliver'd to him when all that business was in agitation, that he speaks of, and it seems to serve his own turn; and if Dr. Gauden may be allowed to be the Author, then 'tis *credible* enough, that the King had leisure to correct and interline it, which supposes *minding* it, and *minding* it carefully too; and moreover, to transcribe the whole Book, (for that word *perhaps* implies at least the credibility of it,) but if he was the Author of it himself, it is by no means to be believed, that *he should have so much leisure to mind it, or would lose any time in writing of it.* And I perceive, with our Author, *the King in all reason might spend his time about Dr. Gauden's Book, but at the same time it was so precious, that he had none at all to spare about his own.* He *really believes* the King did correct and interline this Book, and at the same time it surpasses his belief, that he should have so much leisure to mind it; he thinks it *credible* he might *transcribe the whole Book*, and at the same time thinks it *incredible* he would lose any time in writing of it. I find some mens

reason

reason and belief are very flexible things, and they have them at good command, when they can believe the same thing credible and incredible, reasonable and unreasonable, as occasion serves. For let the Book be what or whose you please, *the leisure to mind it*, and *the losing time about it*, are certainly the same; in the mean time, what leisure the King had, and what time to spare about this Book, during the Treaty, certainly there was not much required to finish it: as far as it goes; for the subject matter of it ends before the Treaty began, perhaps the correcting it in some places, the adding some passages, the compleating and finishing one Chapter, or two at the most.

However, upon the whole, suppose that a man could give no fair reason, why Mr. *Levet* should see the King write it, and not Mr. *Herbert*; or why the King should leave it in his Bed-chamber, when he went abroad, or what time he had to spare during the Treaty at *Newport*, this would not in the least abate the credit of either of their Testimonies, because it requires a more exact knowledge of time, and place, and other circumstances, than possibly can now be had: why the King should permit Mr. *Levet* to see him write, and not Mr. *Herbert*, and why he should leave it in his Bed-chamber window under the care of Mr. *Levet*, the reasons of these respective actions might be in the King's breast, or they might be visible enough at that time, though they could not now be so well accounted for; and what leisure he had at the Treaty to review it, or add to it, this is nothing to the purpose, nor in the least affects the Testimonies; and the Question only is, whether such things were really done, and not upon what reasons they were done. And when Mr. *Levet* directly affirms, and offers to depose, that the Book was the King's own, that he saw him writing in it, that he read the Manuscript, that the King was mightily concern'd to secure it, that he himself had it in charge, 'tis to much purpose to say that Mr. *Herbert* did not see him write it, that it was not likely he should leave it in his Bed-chamber, for *likely* or not likely, the thing was done, and is sufficiently prov'd; and

nothing can be said to that but by excepting to the credit of the Witness.

P. 146. In the mean time, he hath put off the examining Sir Thomas Herbert's Testimony so long, till he hath utterly forgot it, and I must remind him of it; that he says "He found the Manuscript among the Books which the King gave him, that comparing it with his hand writing in other things, he found it so very like, as to believe it was his own, having seen much of the King's writings before, particularly a Translation of Dr. Sanderson's Book *De Juramentis*, examin'd by himself and Mr. Harrington, and found accurately translated. However, though our Author says nothing to it, he with his usual confidence sums it up thus: *A third presumes the King might write it, because he read a great many Books; and then thus concludes his summary, and they unanimously conclude that he was the genuine Author, because the Book was written with his own hand; all which Testimonies, considering the premises, prove no more nor less than that the King could write and read, which was never denied by any that I know. Now such stuff as this is a shock to any man's modesty, and deserves scorn, but not an Answer: And if he had resolv'd to deal at this rate, he should have adjourn'd the debate to Billingsgate, where he would have met with Antagonists who could have managed a Controversie with him his own way, and at his own weapon.*

P. 145. Our Author hath two Objections yet behind, one is that there should be so many Copies; Mr. Herbert had one left him by the King, and Charles the Second shewed another to Mr. Wood, as Dr. Canaries writes; and although our Author may allow the King to transcribe one Copy, yet he cannot be persuaded that he could find leisure enough to write so many Copies. Now indeed, if this Book had been of Dr. Gauden's composing, 'tis unaccountable that there should be one Copy under the King's own hand, what leisure soever he had; but if it was his own, there was reason enough for more Copies than one; this Book had been taken from him once before, and he was not in such

such good hands, but he might reasonably fear to be rifled again; and seeing he put such a great value upon it, as it justly deserv'd, it was highly reasonable to secure it by more Transcripts, that if one was taken the other might be preserv'd: And for writing so much with his own hand, we may hear the Testimony of a person, who (among others) heard the King discoursing at his table of the advantages he had reap'd by his sufferings, and among them adds this, *Neither (said he) is this all the benefit that Princely my present infelicity hath brought me; for this groundless Pellican distaste of the Publick, hath made me my own Private Secretary, I am now become my own Amanuensis: My abilities, though mean, may now appear, for I have none to enable them; I have sometimes held it sufficient to dictate to a pen, but now those directories in all likelyhood are to be estranged from me, I must accommodate my garb to my present Fortunes,——Princes in distress may not be ashamed to be their own Secretaries.*

The next is, *Why is none of these ever since produc'd? How came this Prince's Autographs to be thus neglected, when his day is so strictly observ'd?* This is a pure Objection, to deny the Book because the original Copy is not produc'd; and yet he hath been told by Sir Thomas Herbert, that he had it, and given him by the King too, and that I think is producing it, except he thinks nothing is producing it, but sending it about to be seen. Sir Thomas's Testimony is sufficient to shew that it was in being, and probably is so still in Sir Thomas's Study. But that I suppose is not the business, the sting of the Objection lies in the reason, *when His Day is so strictly observ'd*; our Author could pardon the Autographs, if the people would but let the Day alone; this is a nuisance and grievance to the Nation, the occasion of abundance of mischief, and he hath bestow'd near four Pages against the observing it, and among others hath these remarkable expressions, *Be- sides that for many weighty reasons such days ought not to be perpetuated, or otherwise in a little time ours will be as full as the Roman Calandar. Such days, i. e. such days*

as the 30th. of *January*, (for he is speaking of that, and of that only,) and shall we have as many *Royal Martyrs* to fill our Calendar, as the *Papists* have *Saints*? and all this in a little time too? This is a terrible sort of a reason for laying aside such days, or otherwise our Calendar will be over-loaded with them. And our Author's doctrine suits well with this, *If there was ever any power in England of curing the King's Evil, it was plainly lodg'd in the People.*

P. 170.

The next is the Testimony of Mr. *Royston* the Bookfeller, which our Author tells us signifies nothing to the merits of the Cause; for to be sure the Bookfeller was not made privy to the Secret. Very well, but suppose the Bookfeller was made privy to the Secret, then I hope it may signify something to the merits of the Cause; and Mr. *Royston*, affirms

P. 147.

Vind. p. 41. not only "That the King sent him a message *October* before, "to prepare all things ready for printing some papers he "should shortly send him; but also, "That it was this "very Copy brought the 23d. of *December* next following. And to confirm this I had added two other Testimonies, of Mr. *Milbourn* and Mr. *Clifford*, who both assisted at the printing it, and testify that they had printed several other things of King *Charles*, and that the Copy they printed it by was transcrib'd by Mr. *Odert*. And Mr. *Clifford* moreover affirms, that the first Title, the *Royal Plea*, was chang'd (by leave from the King) into *Icon Basilike* by Dr. *Jeremiah Taylor*; and the reason of that was, least it should be suppress'd by two Informers, *Cheltenham* and *Jones*, and the Title being Greek might be less taken notice of by them. These Testimonies joyn'd with Mr. *Royston's*, are exceeding strong and full; Mr. *Royston* testifies to the King's message, and to the very Copy in pursuance of that message; the Printer and Corrector testify to the hand in which it was written, and one of them to the change of the Title, to the person by whose advice it was chang'd, and the reason of it; and 'tis hardly possible more could be said in this Case, except they had received the Book from the hands of the King himself. And one would think this might have

have desert'd a little of our Author's pains, especially considering that if this Testimony be suffered to stand uncontrouled, the supports of his Cause are perfectly ruin'd; for if this be true, Dr. *Walker's* Account, and Mrs. *Gauden's* Narrative are both false. And I crave leave to mind him, that his not disproving will be construed an acknowledgment, and all indifferent men will conclude that he yields what he does not except to, and while he leaves untouched such pregnant Testimonies, he gives up his Cause, and deserts it in the plain field.

For a Conclusion of this particular I had mention'd two Authors, who speak directly to the matter, and testify their own knowledge of the King's being the Author, which our Author thus discreetly answers, *We shall hear and examine them when they'll please to tell us their names, though all they have to say is answered already.* This last is a bold stroke, for one of them says, *he knew the King's hand, he had seen the Manuscript, he had heard him own it;* and the other gives a particular account of the King's intentions and discourses relating to this Book, how early it began, upon what occasion, and what steps he made in it; and is all this answer'd already? I perceive our Author hath a very quick hand at answering. But I suppose he means they are answer'd as well as all the rest, and that is true enough; for there is not much difference between answering nothing, and answering nothing to the purpose. In the mean time, 'tis very ridiculous to except to the truth of an Author for no other reason but only not publishing his name; and especially by such a one who doth the same thing himself; and if this be a reason, I perceive our Author does not expect that *The Life of John Milton*, and *Amyntor*, should find much credit in the world: However, there was good reason for those Authors to conceal themselves, Truth was at that time a little too dangerous for a man to set his name to it; and although I doubt not, if we could recover their names, but the character of the persons would set a great value upon their Testimony; nevertheless, they have still their weight, and their Authority ought not to be rejected,

jected, but upon very good reasons, which our Author cannot conveniently spare at this time, especially when they deliver nothing but what very well agrees with the thing it self, and concurs in substance and circumstance with other Testimony; particularly one of them tells us, " That these " Meditations were seized at *Naseby*, and by the benignity " of the Conquerour were recovered again, and returned to " the King, which infinitely cheer'd him. And this Book was printed in 1649. near thirty years before Major *Huntington* made his relation to Sir *William Dugdale*; and when the same Testimony, in the same circumstances, is delivered at different times, on severall occasions, and by divers persons, they plainly corroborate each other, and there can be no possible reason to doubt of the truth and sincerity of the Evidence.

Having thus dispatch'd what our Author hath, and what he hath not excepted to, I shall produce some farther Testimony to prove that the King was the true and genuine Author.

The first is the Testimony of Mr. *Barry*, a Counsellor of *Gray's-Inn*, who in a Letter to a friend, bearing date April 28. 1699. (and which Letter I have now in my hands) gives this memorable story, and I shall set it down in his own words. *When I was a Student, and after a young Barrester of the honourable Society of Grays-Inn, I used in the long vacation to come down and pay my duty to my Father, and at the same time I did the like to Sir William Morton, then a reverend Judge of the King's-Bench, who (without boasting) admitted me to almost an intimacy with him; with whom dining one day, and dinner being over, the Judge over a bottle of Wine and a Pipe, discours'd of the strange parts, great wisdom, and abilities of Charles the First, with whom he said he had been very conversant. To all which I answered, and said, And yet they will not allow him to be the Author of the Book called ~~the~~ *Barons*. To which the Judge laying his hand gently on mine said, young Gentleman, or Mr. Barry, I am an old man, but you may live to tell, as occasion offers, what I shall now relate to you, when I (meaning himself) was a*
Collonel

Collonel in the late King's Army, and upon a time, the Army marching about Stow in Gloucestershire, the King lead the Horse himself, and one Sir William Vavisor the Foot, when a storm of rain fell, and it happened so great, as separated the Horse from the Foot, and the King was forc'd to betake himself to a Countrey Village, where the best house was an Ale-house; into which the King was no sooner got, but he was concern'd lest Sir William Vavisor should fall into the Enemies quarters, for want of orders to march; whereupon the King (said the Judge) call'd me, and it was agreed upon, orders should be sent to Sir William Vavisor; whereupon pen, ink and paper was call'd for, but the house affording neither, the King pulled out of his own pocket a pen and ink, and likewise a piece of paper, which the Judge said he gave him, with which the Judge said he retired into another room or apartment, and going to write on the paper, he found one side of the paper written upon by the King's own hand, with which the Judge told me he was very well acquainted: the Judge told me the writing was to this effect, or the very same words: As to the Rebels taking of my Letters, as it was an advantage they could not well expect, so they knew not how with civility to use; for allways amidst the greatest advantages are the greatest obligations, and such should I have esteem'd the concealment of my Letters, which challenge a privacy from all who are not wholly barbarous. Which when the Judge had read, the Judge told me he carried the paper to the King again, and told his Majesty, he thought he design'd that paper for some other use; which when the King lookt on, he said, Cry mercy, and put it in his pocket again, out of which the Judge told me the King gave him another paper, on which the Judge told me he wrote orders, and sent them to Sir William Vavisor, as the King commanded; moreover, the Judge bid me look in the Book when I came home, in the Chapter containing the King's sentiments on that occasion, and I did so, and found the same passage, or words to the same effect, which I have retain'd in my memory ever since, having hardly seen the Book since, which was in the long vacation, sixty six.

M

The

The next is the Testimony of Mr. Symmons's Widow. And it is agreed on all hands, that Mr. Symmons was the person who was only concern'd in the printing it, and who was privy to the whole matter; this Mrs. Gauden and Dr. Walker assert, and this is attested on the other side, and Sir William Dugdale affirms it, and consequently his Evidence must be of great weight in this Case, and neither side can except against it; and thus it follows *verbatim* as I received it from the Reverend Mr. Spincks, who took it from her own mouth.

The Testimony of Mrs. Ellen Spanne, formerly Wife of the Reverend Mr. Edward Symmons, Rector of Rayne in the County of Essex.

The said Mrs. Spanne testifieth, that in or about the year 1648. seeing her Husband, Mr. Symmons, reading some papers written in a hand she was wholly unacquainted with, and which she therefore concluded not to be his own, she enquired of him whose they were? and where he had them? In relation to the latter of which enquiries, he desired her not to insist upon it, because he was unwilling to inform her, for this reason, that if called any way to account, she might be able to swear that she knew not how he came by them. As to the other, he answer'd that they were the King's, and were sent him to the end he might get them printed. Not long after, he committed them to the Press, and some Sheets of them being printed, were brought to his Lodgings in Carter Lane, and there were seized by Souldiers, who were sent to plunder him, which somewhat retarded the publication of them; though the original papers, being then in the Printer's hands, escaped their search, and so at length the Book (i. e. the Icon Basilike) came forth. Not long after her said Husband Mr. Symmons died, and some time after her Husband's death, this said Mrs. Symmons was invited to dine with one Mr. Robinson behind the Royal Exchange, who after dinner took her aside, and desired her to deal truly and freely with him, in a matter that he had to propound to her, which was about the Author of Icon Basilike; to whom she replied, that it was in truth the King's: He farther requested

quested of her to tell him if it was not her Husband's, adding withall, that it would be for her advantage to speak the Truth; whereto she again answer'd, that it was not her Husband's, but the King's, and her Husband was only employed to get it printed; assuring him moreover, that when her said Husband lay on his death-bed, he was pressed by one to declare the Truth in this particular, and that he answer'd the person thus pressing him (who was his Physitian Dr. Bathurst, though she did not then think fit to name him to Mr. Robinson,) that it was certainly the King's, and that he did neither add to, nor diminish from it in any respect, but sent it away to the Press exactly as it came to his hands. Thus much Mr. Symmons professed a little before his death, and thus much his Widow, Mrs. Symmons, owned before Mr. Robinson, when enticed by him to the contrary; and she yet believes, and shall allways believe, that as verily as she is now alive, the aforesaid Icon Basilike was the King's own Book, composed by himself, and written in his own hand.

Signed this 5th of Febr. 1691.

Ellen Spanne.

in the presence of Ric. Hughes, Tho. Spanne.

And now to sum up this Evidence in behalf of the King, in order, here we have Judge Morton reading some of it in a rough draught, in the King's own hand, in a Paper taken out of the King's Pocket; Major Huntington recovered the Manuscript it self by the favour of General Fairfax, and delivered it to the King at Hampton Court; Mr. Levett saw the King divers times writing of it, read it in Manuscript, and had the Book it self in charge in the Isle of Wight; Sir Thomas Herbert had the Book it self given him by the King, written with his own hand, and which he compar'd with other of the King's Writings; Mr. Symmons, to whose care the printing of it was committed, testifies upon his death-bed that it was the King's own; Mr. Royston the Bookseller had a message from the King, to prepare for the printing some papers, and which papers were this very Copy, brought December the 23. following; the Printer and Corrector testifie, that the Copy they prin-

ted it by, was written by the hand of Secretary *Oder*; and the Corrector farther declares, that to prevent the seizing it by Informers, the Title was changed (by leave from the King) by Dr. *Jeremiah Taylor*. This is full and accumulative Evidence, and all direct to the matter; and without any observation upon it, I shall leave the Reader entirely to judge for himself, whether a matter of fact of this nature be not more than sufficiently, even abundantly prov'd.

We come at length to King *James's* Letters Patents to Mr. *Chiswell*, to reprint the Works of King *Charles I.* to confront which, our Author tells a long story, which I shall not need to repeat, but only acquaint the Reader that I made bold to write to Sir *Roger Lestrage*, and he did me the favour to return me an Answer; both which Letters I shall lay before him, and then leave him to judge of the whole matter. Mine to Sir *Roger* was as follows.

Sir, Finding your name mention'd in a Book called Amynator, p. 151. and a story along with it, wherein it is my hap to be a little concern'd, I take the freedom to beg the favour of an Answer from you to the Three following Queries, if it may stand with your good liking.

1. *Whether upon your application to King James for a Recommendatory Letter, in behalf of Mr. Chiswel, to print, or recommend the Works of King Charles the First, did the King refuse this request or not?*

2. *Did the King refuse, and give this reason for his refusal, that Icon Basilike was not his Father's Book?*

3. *Did you ever tell Mr. Chiswel of this; or any other such resolution of the said King?*

A Line or two in return upon these heads will highly oblige,
May 4. 1699. *Sir, Your, &c.*

Sir Roger's Answer follows verbatim.

Sir, In answer to your Three Questions, in order as they lie, and in as few words as possible.

1. *The Request was so far from being refused, that it was granted, and the Book printed under the Authority of that License.*

2. *I never heard the King say, that Icon Basilike was not his Father's Book, or any thing to that purpose.*

3. *I never told Mr. Chiswel of any such Resolution taken by the said King, as is above mentioned.*

This is the plain Truth of the Case, and it is at your service, to make what use of it you please.

May 5. 1699.

Sir, I am your, &c.

Roger Lestrange.

Lastly, our Author speaks to *Pamela's Prayer*, hath recited it at large, and takes abundance of pains to prove that it was really used by the King, which from him is the pleasantest thing in the world : He hath all along been endeavouring to prove the whole Book a forgery, and father'd upon the King, and why not the Prayer too? why is not the Prayer *Dr. Gauden's*, as well as the Book? And his reason for this makes it yet more pleasant, which is *that Mr. Roylston printed it* : P. 154. Why, *Mr. Roylston* printed the whole Book, and moreover affirms that it was brought to him from the King, (which is more than ever was said of the Prayer,) and if *Mr. Roylston's* printing and attesting, are not sufficient to prove the Book genuine, how comes his bare printing without any farther circumstance, to be such an extraordinary proof for the use of the Prayer? This is very righteous dealing, and our Author shewes his justice, when any thing will pass to prove what he thinks reflects on the King's memory, and yet the very same proofs, and a hundred times more strong and pregnant, must be all insufficient to prove what makes for his Honour. And whatever our Author thinks, this is a very severe reflection on his proceedings, and plainly shewes that he disputes with a byass, and there is corruption at the bottom; for there is nothing more shameless and immodest, as well as irrational, to insist with assurance on those very proofs which he denies to his Adversaries. In the mean time, that this *Prayer* was a forgery, and a forgery of his friend *Milton* too, I had prov'd beyond exception, by a testimony from *Mr. Hill* the Printer, " Who told *Dr. Vind. p. 53.* *Gill* and *Dr. Bernard* that it was inserted by the contrivance of *Milton* and *Bradshaw*, to bring a scandal on the

" Book,

" Book, and blast the reputation of its Author; and the
 " occasion was, that Mr. *Dugard*, *Milton's* intimate Friend,
 " being taken printing an Edition of the King's Book, *Mil-*
 " *ton* got him off, by *Bradshaw's* interest, on condition that
 " he should add *Pamela's* Prayer to the Book. This our
 Author calls a *gross fable*; and the reason is, *when it does*
not appear that Dugard, who was Printer to the Parlia-
ment, ever printed this Book. Does not appear, i. e. *does*
not appear to him; and it is very bold to call this a *gross*
fable, because he does not know whether Mr. *Dugard* printed
 the Book or not. Does he think his ignorance of a matter
 is sufficient to make it a *gross fable*? at this rate we are like
 to have a pure *History of the Canon*, when every thing he is
 ignorant of, must be a *gross forgery*; and we shall have *spu-*
rious Authors enow, if his ignorance be sufficient to give
 them that Title. However, whether our Author knows it
 or not, it is certain that Mr. *Dugard* printed this Book, and
 was catch'd printing of it too; and I have now before me
 an information of Mr. *Hooker*, given March 30. 91. where-
 in he affirms that *he* (the said Mr. *Hooker*) was *Corrector* to
 Mr. *Dugard's* Press in 48; that *Leon Basilike* was printed at
 that Press, with the correction of Mr. *Hooker*; that Mr.
Dugard being known, was thrown into prison, and turn'd
 out of his place of Merchant Taylor's School, and that Mr.
Hooker to save himself went to travel for several years.
 And what now does he think of his *does not appear*? if he
 did not know it before, I hope now it appears sufficiently,
 not only that Mr. *Dugard* printed it, but was like to be ru-
 in'd for it; and Mr. *Hill* tells us how he escaped the dan-
 ger, and came into favour again, and was restor'd to the
 School, even by performing an honest piece of work for
 Mr. *Milton*, and claping in *Pamela's* Prayer into the King's
 Book, to discredit the whole. And in the next Edition of
John Milton's Life, our Author, if he please, may add this
 as one of his Master-pieces.

There is yet behind one entire branch of this Controversie,
 and that is, *the intrinsic Proof*, drawn from the Book it
 self, in the following instances, *the Stile, the Historical*
part

part of it, the King's secret intentions, and matters of his Conscience; and each of these I had particularly spoke to, and from thence endeavour'd, and I think plainly made it appear, not only that Dr. Gauden was not, but that no other person possibly could be the Author of it, but the King himself. But this our Author serves just as the other, he flirts at it a little, but will not upon any terms be brought to mention, much less to answer any one of those reasons that conclude for the King. Thus for instance, in one corner of his Book he says, *a multitude of others agree with me, that the stile is infinitely liker that of a Doctor than a King*; and so one entire paragraph, and a comparison between the King's stile and that of Dr. Gauden is concisely answer'd: if this be the case, why did he trouble himself to write at all? he might have told us in short that he and his friends had agreed upon the point, let other people say what they will, and so all his Book might have been spared; whereas, as I take it, his business was to answer my reasons, and not to scorn his Readers, with telling them what he and some others agree about it; for let them agree what they please, except he gives the reasons of such agreement, the Reader is never the wiser. In like manner, in another place he tells us, *as to the King's secret intentions, and remorse of Conscience, the Book was written for that end, and the Author's design was to give such a colour to all the King's actions*. But why did not he shew his Reader what colour that was, and leave him to judge whether it was a fucus and paint, or a natural complexion? why, because he durst not trust him with it; and it would look a little hideously to tell his Reader, *the Author's design was to give a colour to the King's actions, and to tell fine things of his gracious purposes*, by charging him in downright terms with acting against his Conscience, and in a case of blood; and moreover, aggravating it to the utmost, and that it had greater aggravations upon him than any man, and charging the calamities that befell him, as a judgment for the guilt of that sin. In like manner it would have look'd strangely to have told his Reader, *there was a Counterfeit Author, who*

P. 111.

P. 105.

who had *forg'd secret intentions* for the King; and when he had done, had *appealed to God* in the most solemn manner for the truth of them, and moreover had called for Divine Vengeance *upon himself and his father's house* if those intentions were not most true. This I suppose, would have a little shock'd his Reader, and therefore it was not fit by any means that he should see it; and whatever our Author may talk of *setting colours and telling fine things*, I presume all men will think that nothing but a Devil could *appeal and imprecate* in that manner upon *counterfeits and forgeries*. But this whole matter of the *Intrinsic Proof* is too considerable to be slightly pass'd over, and therefore

Vind. p. 45. I must refer the Reader to the *Vindication*. This little is
to 49. enough to shew how fairly our Author hath answered this branch of proofs, when he hath not mentioned any one of the reasons, and never will do it; and I have nothing farther to do, but to leave it with the Reader whether I have not abundantly made good the charge I laid down against him at the beginning.

For a Conclusion I must account with our Author for his civility in giving me a *name*, he does it with great assurance throughout his Book, and I desire to know by what authority? if he says common fame, (and I am sure he can have no more, if he has that,) that is a very odd reason for a man who writes a Book against the common opinion of a whole age, and will not suffer the fame of more than fifty years to make good an Author's title. And this same common fame gives out, that one Mr. Toland is the Author of *Anytor*, but I think that is not a sufficient reason for me to charge that Gentleman with all those misrepresentations and unfair proceedings above; let that Author answer for himself, and so long as he thinks fit to conceal his name, he may take his liberty; whom those initial Letters *J. T.* mean at the end of the Epistle, concerns neither me nor the Question, and I shall not trouble my self to enquire.

F I N I S.



